

## **Historic, Archive Document**

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.



## LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

Public Law 590--81st Congress

Chapter 426--2d Session

S. 3550

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Digest of Public Law 590 . . . . .	1
Index and Summary of History on S. 3550 . . . . .	1



IMPORT CONTROLS. Continues until June 30, 1951 certain powers, authority, and discretion for the purpose of exercising, administering, and enforcing import controls with respect to fats and oils (excluding coconut and coconut products), and rice and rice products.

INDEX AND SUMMARY OF HISTORY ON S. 3550

May 5, 1950	S. 3550 was reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency. Senate Report 1538. Print of the bill as reported.
June 6, 1950	H. R. 8737 was introduced by Rep. Spence and was referred to the House Committee on Banking and Currency. Print of the bill as introduced. (Companion bill).
June 8, 1950	S. 3550 was debated and passed the Senate with amendments.
June 13, 1950	Print of S. 3550 as referred to the House Committee on Banking and Currency.
June 16, 1950	House Committee reported H. R. 8737 without amendment. House Report 2272. Print of the bill as reported.
June 28, 1950	House Rules reported H. Res. 680 for the consideration of S. 3550. House Report 2367. Print of the measure.
June 29, 1950	House debated and passed S. 3550 without amendment.
June 30, 1950	Approved. Public Law 590.









# Calendar No. 1551

81ST CONGRESS }  
2d Session }

SENATE

{ REPORT  
{ No. 1538

## AUTHORITY TO EXERCISE IMPORT CONTROLS ON FATS AND OILS AND RICE AND RICE PRODUCTS

MAY 5 (legislative day, MARCH 29), 1950.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. MAYBANK, from the Committee on Banking and Currency,  
submitted the following

### REPORT

[To accompany S. 3550]

The Committee on Banking and Currency, having considered the same, report favorably a committee bill (S. 3550) to continue for a temporary period certain powers, authority, and discretion for the purpose of exercising, administering, and enforcing import controls with respect to fats and oils and rice and rice products, and recommend that the bill do pass.

#### GENERAL STATEMENT

Unless extended, the authority of the President to control imports of fats and oils (including oil-bearing materials, fatty acids, butter, soap, and soap powder, but excluding petroleum and petroleum products) and rice and rice products, under the provisions of the Second Decontrol Act of 1947, as amended, will expire on June 30, 1950. This bill would continue that authority until July 1, 1951, and add certain provisions to the law which are intended to mesh the exercise of authority over import controls with the obligations of the United States as a party to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, adopted at the conclusion of the second session of the Preparatory Committee of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Employment and executed at Geneva, Switzerland, on October 30, 1947.

The committee gave consideration to S. 2905, which would have extended the control authority for 1 year, and S. 3382, which would have extended such authority for 2 years. However, in view of the need for interlocking operations of these controls with the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, the committee deemed it advisable to report a clean bill from the committee.

The first session of the Eighty-first Congress adopted Public Law 155 in order to enable the Department of Agriculture to work off at

not too great a monetary loss the surplus of fats and oils built up in the Commodity Credit Corporation as a result of wartime price-support programs. Too great an influx of competitive fats and oils from abroad would have driven the domestic market price down to a considerable extent, resulting in even greater loss to the Commodity Credit Corporation in its surplus-disposal program. The retention of import controls under the authority of Public Law 155 enabled the Department of Agriculture to prevent this extra loss from occurring.

The Secretary of Agriculture has informed the committee that the liquidation of the surplus stocks for which the authority granted in Public Law 155 has been used is not expected to be completed by June 30, 1950. He recommended that the authority in that law be continued for an additional time for the purpose of facilitating the orderly liquidation of such stocks. The Secretary stated that he recognizes that the authority in Public Law 155 is a temporary or stop-gap measure to take care of an unusual temporary situation. He further declared that it is not to be deemed to alter fundamental policy in respect to international trade and is not designed to offer a long-range solution to the general problem growing out of imports of agricultural commodities for which support programs are in effect in the United States. The bill provides that import controls shall be removed as soon as the conditions giving rise to them have ceased.

The Secretary of Agriculture has indicated his intention to apply the controls judiciously and use them to limit, rather than exclude entirely, imports of fats and oils. However, he anticipated controls might have to be rigid in connection with a program to remove a temporary surplus by making it available to certain groups of domestic consumers free of charge or at prices below the current market level. He also pointed out that where, as a result of unforeseen developments, increased imports of a product cause or threaten serious injury to domestic producers, it would be necessary to take action to prevent or remedy such injury.

The General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade recognizes the need for import controls under abnormal situations such as those contemplated by the Secretary of Agriculture. Article XI of that agreement permits import restrictions on any agricultural or fisheries product where necessary to the enforcement of governmental measures which operate—

to restrict the quantities of the like domestic product permitted to be marketed or produced, or, if there is no substantial domestic production of the like product, of a domestic product for which the imported product can be directly substituted.

Article XI of the agreement also condones such import restrictions necessary to the enforcement of governmental measures which operate—

to remove a temporary surplus of the like domestic product, or, if there is no substantial domestic production of the like product, of a domestic product for which the imported product can be directly substituted, by making the surplus available to certain groups of domestic consumers free of charge or at prices below the current market level.

Article XIX of the agreement provides that if, as a result of unforeseen developments and of the effect of obligations incurred by a party to the agreement, including tariff concessions, any product is being imported into the territory of that party in such increased quantities

and under such conditions as to cause or threaten serious injury to domestic producers in that territory of like or directly competitive products, the contracting party shall be free, in respect of such product, and to the extent and for such time as may be necessary to prevent or remedy such injury, to suspend the obligation in whole or in part or to withdraw or modify the concession.

In order to be certain that the authority of the President to exercise import controls should cover these situations mentioned in article XI and article XIX of the agreement, the committee added the criteria set forth in clauses (c), (d), and (e) of the bill. It also retained the criteria set forth in clauses (a) and (b) of the bill in the same form in which they appeared in Public Law 155. These permit the imposition of controls on imports where the President determines such controls to be (a) essential to the acquisition or distribution of products in world short supply or (b) essential to the orderly liquidation of temporary surpluses of stocks owned or controlled by the Government. The criteria in clause (a) have been used in the past to control imports of rice and rice products. There are indications that rice and rice products may now need the protection of import controls because of the factors set forth in clause (b).

An added difficulty in the administration of the provisions of this bill is presented by the fact that the criteria in clause (b) are also found in part II of article XX of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, and control measures taken under part II which are inconsistent with other provisions of the agreement are, by the express terms of the agreement, to be removed not later than January 1, 1951. However, the Department of Agriculture and the Department of State have indicated that they feel the objectives of the bill can be achieved within the framework of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. The committee assumes, naturally, that ways will be found to exercise the powers granted in this bill so that no international obligation undertaken by this Nation will be breached. It likewise assumes that in exercising import-control authority the restrictions contained in the agreement will be observed unless they are altered or waived in a manner meeting the approval of other parties to the agreement.

In reporting favorably this bill, the committee intends to continue in the President all power granted to him in Public Law 155, Eighty-first Congress, and to grant him the further authority to exercise import controls on fats and oils and rice and rice products under the circumstances set forth in clauses (c), (d), and (e) of the bill.

It should be noted that in reporting this bill favorably, the committee is acting in line with the spirit of a recommendation made by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. In Senate Report No. 1374, dated March 29, 1950, that committee's Subcommittee on Senate Resolution 36 recommended the extension for 2 years of the import control authority provided by Public Law 155, Eighty-first Congress. The report stated:

The hearings held by the subcommittee from April 1949 and throughout the remainder of the first session of the Eighty-first Congress have been exhaustive investigations into every phase of the fats-and-oil situation, edible and inedible. These hearings justify a report to the Congress through the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry on the essential facts and conclusions reached by the committee.



✓ The hearings and report have been made available to the members and staff of the Committee on Banking and Currency and have been considered in the preparation of this bill.

Both the Department of Agriculture and the Department of State favor the extension of import-control authority for 1 year beyond June 30, 1950, at this time. The committee is of the opinion that such action will assure a review by Congress before July 1, 1951, of the need for further import-control authority for fats and oils and rice and rice products after that date. The extension of the authority for 1 year will also enable a review of the consonance of import control authority in these fields with the Nation's international obligations existing at that time.

It is realized that this bill would become immediately effective on the day it becomes a law. Should that date be prior to July 1, 1950, the effect of the bill would be to add to the present criteria which the President may use in determining the imposition of import controls on fats and oils and rice and rice products to be necessary, before the expiration of Public Law 155. The committee sees no objection to this situation.

Although this bill neither specifically amends nor repeals existing law, in compliance with the spirit of subsection (4) of rule XXIX of the Standing Rules of the Senate, changes in existing law (Public Law 155, 81st Cong.) made by the bill, as reported, are shown as follows (existing law's expiration date is shown in black brackets, new matter is printed in italics, existing law is which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, title III of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended, and the amendments to existing law made by such title shall continue in effect, until **[July 1, 1950]** *July 1, 1951*, for the purpose of authorizing the exercising, administering, and enforcing of import controls with respect to fats and oils (including oil-bearing materials, fatty acids, butter, soap, and soap powder, but excluding petroleum and petroleum products) and rice and rice products, upon a determination by the President that such controls are (a) essential to the acquisition or distribution of products in world short supply or (b) essential to the orderly liquidation of temporary surpluses of stocks owned or controlled by the Government or (c) *essential to the enforcement of governmental measures which operate to restrict the quantities of the like domestic product permitted to be marketed or produced, or, if there is no substantial domestic production of the like product, of a domestic product for which the imported product can be directly substituted or (d) essential to the enforcement of governmental measures which operate to remove a temporary surplus of the like domestic product, or, if there is no substantial domestic production of the like product, of a domestic product for which the imported product can be directly substituted, by making the surplus available to certain groups of domestic consumers free of charge or at prices below the current market level or* (e) essential to prevent the importation of any product, as a result of unforeseen developments and of the effect of the obligations incurred by a contracting party under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade to which the United States is a party, in such increased quantities and under such conditions as to cause or threaten serious injury to domestic producers in the United States of like or directly competitive products: *Provided, however, That such controls shall be removed as soon as the conditions giving rise to them have ceased.*

Calendar No. 1551

81<sup>ST</sup> CONGRESS  
2<sup>D</sup> SESSION

**S. 3550**

[Report No. 1538]

---

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MAY 5 (legislative day, MARCH 29), 1950

Mr. MAYBANK, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, reported the following bill; which was read twice and placed on the calendar

---

**A BILL**

To continue for a temporary period certain powers, authority, and discretion for the purpose of exercising, administering, and enforcing import controls with respect to fats and oils (including butter), and rice and rice products.

1        *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*  
2        *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*  
3        That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, title III  
4        of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended, and the  
5        amendments to existing law made by such title shall con-  
6        tinue in effect until July 1, 1951, for the purpose of author-  
7        izing and exercising, administering, and enforcing of import  
8        controls with respect to fats and oils (including oil-bearing  
9        materials, fatty acids, butter, soap and soap powder, but  
10        excluding petroleum and petroleum products) and rice and

1 rice products, upon a determination by the President that  
2 such controls are (a) essential to the acquisition or dis-  
3 tribution of products in world short supply or (b) essential  
4 to the orderly liquidation of temporary surpluses of stocks  
5 owned or controlled by the Government or (c) essential  
6 to the enforcement of governmental measures which operate  
7 to restrict the quantities of the like domestic product per-  
8 mitted to be marketed or produced, or, if there is no sub-  
9 stantial domestic production of the like product, of a domestic  
10 product for which the imported product can be directly  
11 substituted or (d) essential to the enforcement of govern-  
12 mental measures which operate to remove a temporary  
13 surplus of the like domestic product, or, if there is no sub-  
14 stantial domestic production of the like product, of a domestic  
15 product for which the imported product can be directly  
16 substituted, by making the surplus available to certain groups  
17 of domestic consumers free of charge or at prices below the  
18 current market level or (e) essential to prevent the importa-  
19 tion of any product, as a result of unforeseen developments  
20 and of the effect of the obligations incurred by a contracting  
21 party under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade  
22 to which the United States is a party, in such increased

1 quantities and under such conditions as to cause or threaten  
2 serious injury to domestic producers in the United States of  
3 like or directly competitive products: *Provided, however,*  
4 That such controls shall be removed as soon as the conditions  
5 giving rise to them have ceased.

Calendar No. 1551

81<sup>ST</sup> CONGRESS  
2<sup>D</sup> Session

**S. 3550**

[Report No. 1538]

---

## **A BILL**

---

To continue for a temporary period certain powers, authority, and discretion for the purpose of exercising, administering, and enforcing import controls with respect to fats and oils (including butter), and rice and rice products.

---

By Mr. MAYBANK

---

MAY 5 (legislative day, March 29), 1950

Read twice and placed on the calendar







81<sup>ST</sup> CONGRESS  
2<sup>D</sup> SESSION

# H. R. 8737

---

## IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JUNE 6, 1950

Mr. SPENCE introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency

---

## A BILL

To continue for a temporary period certain powers, authority, and discretion for the purpose of exercising import controls with respect to fats and oils, and rice and rice products.

- 1     *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
- 2     *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
- 3     That the Act of July 1, 1949 (Public Law 155, Eighty-
- 4     first Congress), is amended by striking out "July 1, 1950"
- 5     and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1951".

81<sup>ST</sup> CONGRESS  
2<sup>D</sup> SESSION

**H. R. 8737**

---

## **A BILL**

---

To continue for a temporary period certain powers, authority, and discretion for the purpose of exercising import controls with respect to fats and oils, and rice and rice products.

---

By Mr. SPENCE

---

JUNE 6, 1950

Referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency







(a) by a physician who has not been regularly licensed to practice medicine in the District of Columbia, unless he be a commissioned surgeon of the United States Army, Navy, Air Force, or Public Health Service, or a physician employed by the Veterans' Administration; or (b) by a physician who is related by blood or by marriage to the person whose mental condition is in question."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ERIK H. LINDMAN

The bill (H. R. 3675) for the relief of Erik H. Lindman was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the corresponding Senate bill, Calendar No. 1232, Senate bill 1677, will be indefinitely postponed.

#### CLAIMS AGAINST ESTATES OF RECIPIENTS OF OLD-AGE ASSISTANCE IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The bill (S. 2155) to authorize the cancellation or settlement of claims of the District of Columbia against the estates of recipients of old-age assistance was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the first sentence of section 12 of the act entitled "An act to amend the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia in relation to providing assistance against old-age want," approved August 24, 1935 (49 Stat. 747), is amended by inserting before the proviso the following: "Provided, That if the Board of Commissioners or its designated agency finds that an allowance of such claim will work a hardship on the survivors of the deceased, such Board or agency may in its discretion cancel, in whole or in part, or otherwise settle, such claim:"

SEC. 2. The amendment made by this act shall be applicable with respect to the estates of recipients of old-age assistance dying on or after January 1, 1949.

#### TRUSTEES OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CONGREGATION OF GEORGETOWN

The bill (S. 3282) to amend the act entitled "An act to incorporate the trustees of the Presbyterian congregation of Georgetown," approved March 28, 1806, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is on the calendar a House bill, Calendar No. 1677, House bill 7966, which is a companion bill and identical in terms. Is there objection to the substitution of the House bill and its present consideration?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 7966) to amend the act entitled "An act to incorporate the trustees of the Presbyterian congregation of Georgetown," approved March 28, 1806, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 3282 is indefinitely postponed.

#### FIRE DEPARTMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The bill (H. R. 7147) to change the effective date of the act of June 19, 1948, relating to the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, was considered, or-

dered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### AMENDMENT OF THE FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK ACT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6743) to amend the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, as amended, and title IV of the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes, which had been reported to the Committee on Banking and Currency with amendments, on page 2, line 20, after the word "this", to strike out "amendment" and insert "subsection"; on page 3, line 3, after the word "this", to strike out "amendment" and insert "subsection"; in line 9, after the word "this", to strike out "amendment" and insert "subsection"; on page 6, line 14, after the word "stock", to insert "of \$100,000,000"; in line 16, after the word "stock", to strike out "all of which dividends are hereby waived,"; in line 18, after the word "fiscal", to strike out "year (beginning" and insert "year, beginning"; in line 19, after the words "with the", to strike out "first"; in the same line, after the word "year", to strike out "which begins after the date of enactment of this subsection" and insert "1951"; on page 7, line 1, after the word "year", to insert "and the Corporation shall also pay to the Secretary of the Treasury an amount equal to 2 percent simple interest per annum on its capital stock of \$100,000,000 from June 27, 1934, to June 30, 1950, less any amount heretofore paid by the Corporation as dividends on such capital stock"; on page 8, after line 19, to strike out:

SEC. 8. Subsection (b) of section 404 of the National Housing Act, as amended, is repealed and stricken out.

In line 22, to change the section number from "9" to "8"; in line 23, after the word "is", to strike out "re-designated subsection (b) and"; in line 25, to reletter the subsection from "(b)" to "(c)"; on page 9, at the beginning of line 1, to insert "(other than any premium which may be assessed under subsection (b) of this section)", and after line 7, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 9. Subsection (a) of section 405 of the National Housing Act, as amended, is amended by striking out "\$5,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$10,000": *Provided, however,* That this amendment shall become effective only in the event of, and at the same time as, an increase to \$10,000 in the maximum deposit insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I have two technical amendments, really in the nature of committee amendments for the clarification of the bill, one of them dealing with the examination. General Accounting Office authority having been granted, there is no need for two examinations, and this amendment would reduce the examinations to one. I submit the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to insert in the proper place the following:

SEC. 8. The first sentence of section 20 of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, as amended, is amended by striking out the word "twice."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I have one other amendment of the same character, which deals with the termination of the guarantee account after the cancellation of the account.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to add the following new section:

"SEC. 9. Section 407 of the National Housing Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 407. Any insured institution other than a Federal savings and loan association may terminate its status as an insured institution by written notice to the Corporation, and the Corporation, for violation by an insured institution of its duty as such may, after written notice of any such alleged violation of duty and after reasonable opportunity to be heard, by written notice to such insured institution, terminate such status. In the event of the termination of such status, insurance of its accounts to the extent that they were insured on the date of such notice, less any amounts thereafter withdrawn, repurchased, or redeemed which reduce the insured accounts of an insured member below the amount insured on the date of such notice, shall continue for a period of 2 years, but no investments or deposits made after the date of the notice of termination shall be insured. The Corporation shall have the right to examine such institution from time to time during the 2-year period aforesaid. Such insured institution shall be obligated to pay, within 30 days after any such notice of termination, as a final insurance premium, a sum equivalent to twice the last annual insurance premium paid by it. In the event of the termination of insurance of accounts as herein provided the institution which was the insured institution shall give prompt and reasonable notice to all of its insured members that it has ceased to be an insured institution and it may include in such notice the fact that insured accounts, to the extent not withdrawn, repurchased, or redeemed, remain insured for 2 years from the date of such termination, but it shall not further represent itself in any manner as an insured institution. In the event of failure to give the notice to insured members as herein provided the Corporation is authorized to give reasonable notice."

Mr. BRICKER obtained the floor.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. I, of course, have no objection to the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Ohio, but I desired to ask him if he was going to make a brief explanation for the Record.

Mr. BRICKER. I was going to ask unanimous consent that there be included an explanation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this point there be included in the Record an explanation of each of the two amendments.



The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the explanations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**AMENDMENT TO PROVIDE THAT THE FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS BE EXAMINED AT LEAST ANNUALLY INSTEAD OF AT LEAST TWICE ANNUALLY**

The first amendment is a minor amendment. It would add a new section to H. R. 6743, which would have the effect of requiring that the Federal Home Loan Banks be examined at least annually instead of at least twice annually, as is the case under the present statute. It is considered that the present requirement for two examinations annually is more stringent than is necessary, but authority would still exist under the amendment for more frequent examination by the Home Loan Bank Board in any case where it was necessary or desirable. This change is particularly appropriate in view of the fact that the Federal home-loan banks, since the original requirement for semi-annual examination, have been made subject to audit by the General Accounting Office under the provisions of the Government Corporation Control Act.

**AMENDMENT CONCERNING TERMINATION OF INSURANCE OF ACCOUNTS OF A LENDING INSTITUTION INSURED BY THE FEDERAL SAVINGS AND LOAN INSURANCE CORPORATION**

This is also a minor amendment, adding a new section at the end of H. R. 6743. This new section would amend section 407 of the National Housing Act to place terminations of insurance of accounts, either at the instance of an individual insured institution or at the instance of the Corporation, on the same basis.

Under existing law, when an institution insured by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation voluntarily terminates insurance, the accounts of individual investors immediately cease to be insured, but the institution must pay premiums for 3 years thereafter. Where termination is involuntary, payment of premiums and insurance of accounts continue for 5 years. The proposed amendment changes the existing law so as to place voluntary and involuntary terminations of insurance on the same basis. In either type of termination the insurance of existing accounts, less any later withdrawals below the insured amounts, would continue for 2 years and the insured institution would be required to pay as a final premium an amount equal to twice the last annual premium paid by it.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I am happy that the Senate has acted unanimously on this bill, because it puts insured savings and loan associations in the position equivalent to the insured banks under the bill recently passed by the Senate by increasing the amount of individual accounts that may be insured from \$5,000 to \$10,000 and by providing for orderly retirement of the capital stock of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation now held by the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, before the Senate votes on the bill I take the opportunity of commending the Committee on Banking and Currency for reporting the bill. It is one which has long been needed in the banking circles of the country.

The financial institutions in Illinois are peculiarly interested in the bill because there are 378 savings and loan associations in Illinois which are members of the Federal Home Loan Bank of Chi-

cago, and a very high proportion of that number also have their accounts insured by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation. The Illinois membership is equal to almost 10 percent of the entire membership in the Federal Home Loan Bank System throughout the country. This is a remarkable record for a single State and demonstrates the leadership which has been taken by the savings and loan industry in Illinois in the financing of homes and the encouragement of savings.

The bill which has just been passed by the Senate will prove of very material, long-term benefit to savings and loan associations. It, therefore, will aid their contribution to the financing and building of homes.

The Illinois Savings and Loan League and its members have played a very important part in the discussions which have been had during the past several years in connection with the proposals which were incorporated in this legislation.

I am sure that all members of the savings and loan associations of Illinois will be very happy if the Senate acts favorably upon this measure today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, may I make an inquiry of the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee? The bill would reduce the insurance rate from one-eighth to one-sixteenth, would it not?

Mr. MAYBANK. To one-twelfth.

Mr. GEORGE. And raise the amount from \$5,000 to \$10,000.

Mr. MAYBANK. The amount that is insurable, yes.

Mr. GEORGE. The amount that is insurable.

Mr. MAYBANK. It will place these organizations on the same basis as the other banks which are covered by the Federal deposit insurance, providing the House passes the FDIC legislation which the Senate recently enacted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 6743) was read the third time and passed.

**IMPORT CONTROLS ON FATS AND OILS AND RICE AND RICE PRODUCTS—BILL TO FOOT OF CALENDAR**

The bill (S. 3550) to continue for a temporary period certain powers, authority, and discretion for the purpose of exercising, administering, and enforcing import controls with respect to fats and oils (including butter) and rice and rice products, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I fear this is not the sort of bill that should be passed on the mere call of

the calendar. I, therefore, ask that it go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his objection for a moment?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I withhold my objection.

Mr. MAYBANK. Do I understand that the Senator asks that the bill go to the foot of the calendar?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. No; I asked that it go over.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wish to make a statement, with the permission of the Senator from New Jersey who has the floor.

The existing legislation expires in June. This bill was introduced by the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] and the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THREL]. Both Senators have been to see me on many occasions and we have discussed the bill with the Department of Agriculture. Of course, in committee we went thoroughly into the subject. I simply want the two Senators I mentioned to know that the Senator from South Carolina hopes it may be possible to have the bill considered, before the existing legislation expires, because otherwise, as I understand, the Government of the United States will lose a great deal of money in connection with flaxseed and other commodities.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, in that connection I should like to say that a serious situation has existed in the past with respect to the commodities in question. If the existing legislation is not continued all the producers of domestic oils, edible and inedible, animal and vegetable, cottonseed oil, peanut oil, tung oil, and lards are going to be adversely affected and the market will be seriously demoralized. If the distinguished Senator from New Jersey has any amendment in mind I know the distinguished Senator from South Carolina will be glad to consider it.

Mr. MAYBANK. I understood an amendment or amendments are proposed to be offered, and I shall be only too glad to take them to conference. I fear that with the expiration of the existing legislation the country may be flooded with cheap oils, which will ruin the producers of soy beans, cottonseed oil, peanuts, flaxseed, and other commodities.

Mr. GILLETTE. I am convinced that if the present law expires a very demoralizing affect would result. It is my hope that the bill can be passed before the expiration date of the present law.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, may I ask whether the bill received the unanimous approval of the committee?

Mr. MAYBANK. As I remember, it did; yes. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] had an amendment which I think he wishes to offer. But I do not believe any member of the committee voted against the bill in committee.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I reserved the right to vote against it.

Mr. MAYBANK. I said no member of the committee voted against it in committee.



Mr. BRICKER. That is true.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator from Ohio said he had an amendment which he might offer on the floor; but there was no vote in the committee against the bill. Am I not correct? I think I am.

Mr. BRICKER. Yes; except that I reserved the right to vote against the bill.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator has some amendment to offer?

Mr. BRICKER. I have two amendments to offer. I think the bill should go over until we can give it further consideration.

Mr. MAYBANK. Is the Senator willing that the bill go to the end of the calendar so that we may consider it later? I make that inquiry of the Senator from Ohio because he is a member of the committee.

Mr. BRICKER. That would meet with my approval. I will discuss the amendments meantime with the chairman during the course of the afternoon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the bill being placed at the foot of the calendar?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I have no objection to that, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent the bill will be placed at the foot of the calendar.

#### AMENDMENT OF SECTION 14 (b) OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE ACT

The bill (S. 3527) to amend section 14 (b) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. MAYBANK. This bill was unanimously reported from the committee. I wish to read the first paragraph of the general statement of the report of the committee. I think that will explain the bill succinctly better than any brief statement I can make about it. I read as follows:

Under existing law the Federal Reserve banks have authority to buy directly from the Treasury, rather than in the open market, direct obligations of the United States or obligations fully guaranteed by the United States, up to an aggregate holding at one time of \$5,000,000,000. The Federal Reserve banks had this authority without any limitation on holdings from 1913 to 1935. The present authority, which was provided by the Second War Powers Act of 1942, will expire on June 30, 1950. This bill would extend the authority until July 1, 1952.

There was not a vote against the bill in committee. In fact every member of the committee voted in favor of it.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I thank the Senator from South Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3527) to amend section 14 (b) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 14 (b) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended (U. S. C., 1946 ed., title 12, sec. 355), is amended by striking out "July 1, 1950" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1952" and by striking out "June 30, 1950" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1952."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### DEFINITION OF REQUEST FOR RELIEF

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Calendar No. 1612, House bill 3436, to amend section 3 of the Lucas Act with respect to redefinition of request for relief. My excuse for doing so is that I must attend a hearing on the military aid arms bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from New Jersey is always calling for an explanation. Why not permit me to explain the bill? Why does the Senator object?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I am not required to ask for an explanation, Mr. President.

Mr. CONNALLY. No; the Senator is not. Neither are we required to make one.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I would say that I do not approve of having bills called up out of order.

Mr. CONNALLY. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. CONNALLY. I simply wish to add that I cannot be present to look after the bill when it is reached on the calendar.

#### CODIFICATION OF FEDERAL LAWS RELATING TO HOUSING

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 252) calling on the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency for a codification of Federal laws relating to housing, which had been submitted by Mr. BRICKER on April 12, 1950, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency is requested to prepare and transmit to the Senate, on or before January 15, 1951, in form suitable to be printed, a codification of all Federal laws relating to housing, which codification shall contain (1) appropriate explanatory notes and annotations to each section of such codification and (2) suitable headings, reference tables, and indices.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, may I ask what is contemplated by the proposed revision?

Mr. BRICKER. It is proposed that a codification be prepared. When the resolution was first drafted by the legislative counsel the word "compilation" was used. However it is desired to have the laws prepared in a form suitable to be offered for reenactment as a true codification. Thus the housing laws while remaining absolutely unchanged in substance or effect would, where appropriate, be changed in language or ar-

rangement so that they could be more readily understood and so that it would be easier to locate particular provisions.

This is necessary, Mr. President, by reason of the fact that at the present time neither head nor tails nor sense can be made out of the housing laws.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I agree entirely with what the Senator has said. It is necessary that there should be a codification of the laws, as Federal laws, instead of merely rules and regulations which no one understands.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from South Carolina, the chairman of the committee.

To supplement what I have said, Mr. President, let me add that the resolution provides for a complete codification. The committee was advised that the Housing Authority will be able to do that and be able to report to the Congress at the next session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 252) was agreed to.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a more detailed explanation of the resolution, for the information of the Senate.

There being no objection, the explanation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Question. Is it contemplated under the resolution that the housing laws will be collected, exactly as now written, and annotated and indexed merely for ready reference, or is it contemplated that there will be a rearrangement of the provisions and a weeding out of obsolete or duplicate provisions with a view to the laws being offered for reenactment by the Congress?

Answer. The latter is intended. As a matter of fact that is the reason for specifying that a "codification" be prepared. When the resolution was first drafted by the legislative counsel, the word "compilation" was used. However, what we wanted was to have the laws prepared in a form suitable for them to be offered for reenactment as a true codification, so the word "codification" was substituted for the word "compilation." Thus the housing laws, while remaining absolutely unchanged in substance or effect, would, where appropriate, be changed in language or arrangement so that they may more readily be understood and so that it will be easier to locate particular provisions.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5332) to amend section 3 of the act of June 18, 1934, relating to the establishment of foreign-trade zones.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills:

S. 274. An act for the relief of Constantin E. Aramescu;

S. 356. An act for the relief of Hugo Gelger;



S. 404. An act for the relief of Emma L. Jackson;

S. 749. An act for the relief of Ferd H. Gibler;

S. 764. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Forest Lumber Co.;

S. 765. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Algoma Lumber Co. and its successors in interest, George R. Birkelund and Charles E. Siddall, of Chicago, Ill., and Kenyon T. Fay, of Los Angeles, Calif., trustees of the Algoma Lumber Liquidation Trust;

S. 766. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Lamm Lumber Co.;

S. 947. An act for the relief of the Baggett Transportation Co., Inc.;

S. 977. An act for the relief of Jacques Yedid, Henriette Yedid, and Ethel Danielle Yedid;

S. 1146. As act for the relief of Francis W. Dodge;

S. 1423. An act for the relief of Alex Morningstar;

S. 1510. An act for the relief of James I. artley;

S. 1693. An act for the relief of Karin Margareta Hellen and Olof Christer Hellen;

S. 1798. An act for the relief of Mrs. Minda Moore;

S. 1856. An act for the relief of Sisters Maria Rita Rossi, Maria Domenica Paone, Rachele Orlando, Assunta Roselli, Rosa Innocenti, and Maria Mancinelli;

S. 1863. An act for the relief of Fremont Rider;

S. 1929. An act for the relief of Anna Samudovsky;

S. 2070. An act for the relief of the Clark Funeral Home;

S. 2108. An act for the relief of Italo Vespa de Chellis;

S. 2156. An act for the relief of Sister Edeltrudis Clara Weskamp;

S. 2338. An act for the relief of J. M. Arthur;

S. 2339. An act for the relief of the Davis Grocery Co., of Oneida, Tenn.;

S. 2385. An act for the relief of Edward C. Ritchie;

S. 2611. An act for the relief of Roland Roger Alfred Boccia, also known as Roland Barbera;

S. 2646. An act for the relief of the Articaire Refrigeration Co.; and

S. 3090. An act for the relief of Lt. (jg) Charles W. Ireland, Supply Corps, United States Navy, and for other purposes.

#### POSTPONEMENT OF APPLICATION OF CLASSIFICATION ACT TO CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

The bill (H. R. 7889) to postpone the application of the Classification Act of 1949 to certain employees of the Selective Service System was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, may we have an explanation?

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, at present the members and employees of the selective service boards are paid the prevailing rate of compensation in the communities in which the boards serve. If this measure is not enacted, they will have to be paid according to the rates provided for by the General Classification Act.

The purpose of the bill is to provide that in the future they may continue to be paid according to the rates prevailing in the communities. If that is done, it is estimated that a saving of approximately \$40,000 will be had.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 7889) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. LANGER subsequently said: Mr. President, I was not on the floor of the Senate when Calendar No. 1554, House bill 7889, came up. I had intended to offer an amendment. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the votes by which the bill was ordered to a third reading time, read the third time, passed be reconsidered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the bill is before the Senate.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the bill, it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. 2. Section 703 (a) of such act is amended by inserting at the end thereof a new sentence, as follows: "Officers and employees who are otherwise eligible shall receive full credit under this subsection for service at the maximum authorized salary rate specified in the Bacharach Act of May 29, 1928, as amended and supplemented, and the Reed-Jenkins Act of May 29, 1928, as amended, to the same extent as if such service had been at the maximum rate of a grade of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

#### RESCISSION OF ORDER CURTAILING CERTAIN POSTAL SERVICES

The bill (S. 3560) to rescind the order of the Postmaster General curtailing certain postal services was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

#### EXPENDITURES FOR TRAVEL—PERSONAL STATEMENT

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in yesterday morning's Washington Post, in the column "Washington Merry-Go-Round," written by Mr. Drew Pearson, there appeared the following article:

##### CONGRESSIONAL ECONOMY

While Congress preaches economy and prepares to slash another billion dollars from the civilian functions of the Government, Congressmen have indulged in a certain brand of economy that benefits themselves, but not Uncle Sam.

They are evading the 15-percent transportation tax that every other citizen of the United States has to pay. The way they do

this is by claiming their trips are on Government business, when actually they are private.

Worst offenders are Senator WILLIAM LANGER, North Dakota Republican; Representative HOMER ANGELL, Oregon Republican, and Representative ABRAHAM MULLER, New York Democrat.

Legally, they cannot escape the travel tax unless the Government actually pays their fare. And if they are traveling on congressional committee business, that committee must initiate the exemption request.

However, LANGER, ANGELL, and MULLER have been signing their own exemption certificates, using a form that the Bureau of Internal Revenue had ruled not legal for Members of Congress. Ticket offices have been advised not to accept this form from Congressmen, but LANGER, ANGELL, and MULLER have disregarded the warnings of ticket girls.

Mr. President, with all other Senators, I share the concern that we should jealously guard against unfair, unfounded, or ignorant charges and it is in this spirit that I rise to speak.

When I was elected to the United States Senate, I promptly divested myself of every kind and form of private business, not only private business which might interfere with my duties as a Senator, but anything which might take any of my time. I feel that my time, during the term for which I was elected, belongs wholly and entirely to the people.

As a farmer, I immediately transferred or leased all my holdings, with the exception of the old homestead, which has been in the family since 1877. Also, I immediately stopped the practice of law; and during the nearly 10 years that I have been in the Senate, I have not, directly or indirectly, participated in any lawsuit. Also, I have completely divorced myself from all the other business interests which had previously occupied some of my time. Since I have been in the Senate I have not been a director of any corporation, but have devoted my time exclusively to my official duties. Therefore, I have no private business.

Also, I am not a candidate for any office at the coming elections, either primary or general.

In connection with my official duties as Senator, it has often been necessary for me to return to my State at the request of our citizens.

In regard to some of the more recent trips I have taken, and to which Mr. Pearson evidently refers, let me say that there was one, when the Elks Lodge requested me to come to Mandan to give a speech against communism, on I Am an American Day; then there was a trip involving the transfer of Fort Lincoln to the Bismarck Junior College, for which I had introduced a bill which is pending. On that trip I made the startling discovery that an agency of our Government is paying \$1,250 a month rent, although at Fort Lincoln there is a huge building, No. 30, which is standing vacant. Then there are the two trips I made at the request of thousands of citizens to investigate the recent disastrous flood conditions in North Dakota and Minnesota, a disaster without parallel in my State, and resulting in a loss of millions upon millions of dollars.



"upon the payment of the head tax and visa fee."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

MINDEL MALEK

The bill (H. R. 5355) for the relief of Mindel Malek was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McCARRAN. With regard to this bill, I should like to say that a typographical error appears in it, and in that connection I ask leave to insert in the RECORD an explanatory statement.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This is the case of a woman who erroneously believed herself to be a United States citizen and who has actually been admitted to the United States as a United States citizen. She was born in Rumania, and came to the United States at the age of 16, in 1936, when she was admitted as the unmarried minor child of a United States citizen. Her father had been naturalized in 1929, and this woman has consistently believed herself to be a United States citizen as a result of her father's naturalization. Actually under the state of the law at the time, she did not derive citizenship in this way; but she did not learn of this until 1949. Her mother was naturalized in 1943, but since that was subsequent to the passage of the Nationality Act of 1940, that did not confer citizenship on this young woman either.

The record indicates this woman is a person of good character. The purpose of the bill is to let her remain in the United States.

The letter from the Department of Justice, as printed in the committee report, contains a typographical error. Where it states this girl entered the United States on December 24, 1934, it should read "December 24, 1936." That was the actual date of entry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5355) for the relief of Mindel Malek, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 331 of the Nationality Act of 1940 (8 U. S. C. 731), as amended, Mindel Malek may, if otherwise eligible under all other applicable provisions of the nationality laws, file the petition for naturalization prescribed by law.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

MITSUME MIYAMOTO

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6589) for the relief of Mitsue Miyamoto, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary,

with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That, in the administration of the immigration laws, the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, which excludes from admission to the United States aliens who are ineligible to citizenship, shall not apply to Mrs. Cloice Howard Bryan (nee Mitsue Miyamoto), the wife of a citizen of the United States and an honorably discharged veteran of World War II.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

HELGA HOLLEB

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6747) for the relief of Helga Holleb, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment in line 5, after the word "natural-born", to insert "alien."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

ARTHUR CHEN SHU JEE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6756) for the relief of Arthur Chen Shu Jee, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That the provisions of section 2 of the act of December 17, 1943 (8 U. S. C., 1946 ed., sec. 212a), which requires that Chinese alien children of United States citizens shall be charged to the immigration quota for the Chinese, shall be held and considered not to be applicable to Arthur Chen Shu Jee, the son of Dr. Kenneth Chen Huan Jee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

MRS. KYOKO NAKAMURA KORNHAUSER

The Senate proceed to consider the bill (H. R. 6787) for the relief of Mrs. Kyoko Nakamura Kornhauser, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment on page 1, line 10, after "United States", to strike out "armed forces during World War II, and that if otherwise admissible under the immigration laws she shall be granted admission to the United States for permanent residence upon application hereafter filed."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

MRS. KIYO NARUMI MURAKAMI AND KEIKO NARUMI

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6880) for the relief of Mrs. Kiyo Narumi Murakami and Keiko Na-

rumi, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment on page 2, line 5, after the word "natural-born", to insert "alien."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

MRS. NOBUKO ETO HEARD

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6894) for the relief of Mrs. Nobuko Eto Heard, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment on page 1, line 10, after the word "States", to strike out the comma and "and that if otherwise admissible under the immigration laws she shall be granted admission to the United States for permanent residence upon application hereafter filed."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

HISAKO SAKATA IKEZAWA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 7035) for the relief of Hisako Sakata Ikezawa, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That, in the administration of the immigration laws, the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, which excludes from admission to the United States aliens who are ineligible to citizenship, shall not apply to Mrs. Hisako Sakata Ikezawa, the wife of a citizen of the United States and an honorably discharged veteran of World War II.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

IMPORT CONTROLS ON FATS AND OILS (INCLUDING BUTTER), AND RICE AND RICE PRODUCTS

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, earlier in the day Calendar No. 1551, Senate bill 3550, was objected to and was placed at the foot of the calendar. I wonder if we may consider the bill now. I believe the objections which were previously raised have now been overcome.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3550), to continue for a temporary period certain powers, authority, and discretion for the purpose of exercising, administering, and enforcing import controls with respect to fats and oils (including butter) and rice and rice products.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding any other provision of law, title III of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended, and the amendments to existing law made by



such title shall continue in effect until July 1, 1951, for the purpose of authorizing and exercising, administering, and enforcing of import controls with respect to fats and oils (including oil-bearing materials, fatty acids, butter, soap and soap powder, but excluding petroleum and petroleum products) and rice and rice products, upon a determination by the President that such controls are (a) essential to the acquisition or distribution of products in world short supply or (b) essential to the orderly liquidation of temporary surpluses of stocks owned or controlled by the Government or (c) essential to the enforcement of governmental measures which operate to restrict the quantities of the like domestic product permitted to be marketed or produced, or, if there is no substantial domestic production of the like product, of a domestic product for which the imported product can be directly substituted or (d) essential to the enforcement of governmental measures which operate to remove a temporary surplus of the like domestic product, or, if there is no substantial domestic production of the like product, of a domestic product for which the imported product can be directly substituted, by making the surplus available to certain groups of domestic consumers free of charge or at prices below the current market level or (e) essential to prevent the importation of any product, as a result of unforeseen developments and of the effect of the obligations incurred by a contracting party under the general agreement on tariffs and trade to which the United States is a party, in such increased quantities and under such conditions as to cause or threaten serious injury to domestic producers in the United States of like or directly competitive products: *Provided, however*, That such controls shall be removed as soon as the conditions giving rise to them have ceased.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I have three amendments which I wish to offer to the bill. It has been suggested by the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency that he would accept the amendments and take them to conference. One of them I introduce for the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL].

Mr. MAYBANK. I have discussed the matter with the distinguished Senator from Ohio, and I shall be glad to take the amendments to conference. I do not know what the attitude of the House conferees will be. However, I shall be very glad to take the amendments to conference and try to have them accepted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the first amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 5, after the word "Government" it is proposed to insert a colon and the following proviso: "*Provided, however*, That such controls shall be removed as soon as conditions giving rise to them cease."

Mr. MILLIKIN. I wonder whether we could consider all the amendments at one time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator wish to submit the amendments en bloc?

Mr. BRICKER. I shall be glad to have that done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendments.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to strike out the words "or (c) essential," on page 2, line 5; all of lines 6 through

22 on page 2; and all of lines 1 through 5 on page 3.

On page 1, line 10, after the words "petroleum products" it is proposed to insert the words "and coconuts and coconut products."

Mr. BRICKER. That strikes out all the additional material in the Senate bill. However, I want the law left as it is with the 1-year extension, because of the trade agreements which are to be considered this fall. As soon as the conditions which bring about the embargo have passed, the President shall immediately remove the restrictions. That is the substance of the first amendment.

Mr. MAYBANK. As I understand, having discussed the matter with the Senator from Ohio, the restrictions will be lifted as soon as the trade agreements have been completed.

Mr. BRICKER. That would be done anyway, if they were approved.

Mr. MAYBANK. It would cancel them, so to speak.

Mr. BRICKER. It is not for that purpose, however. It is to eliminate the additional language over and above that contained in the act which was passed a year ago.

The last amendment is offered by me for the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL]. It has to do with the importation of coconut oil and coconut products. It is introduced at the instance of candy manufacturers. There is no competing product which they can utilize for the purpose of making coconut candy, and they want those items excluded from the power of the President.

Mr. MAYBANK. Will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. BRICKER. Yes.

Mr. MAYBANK. I will take only 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to ask the Senator if he knows the amount of the importations used by candy manufacturers. I learned of this only last night. The matter did not come before the Committee on Banking and Currency. Is the Senator familiar with the amount? Is it limited?

Mr. BRICKER. There is no limit.

Mr. MAYBANK. I did not mean that. I was told last evening that a certain number of tons came into the country last year. I should like to know what the amount was.

Mr. BRICKER. I do not have the information. I merely have this amendment. I offered it for the Senator from Kansas, to protect the candy industry. I should like to read a letter which was submitted to the Senator from Kansas. It gives the data.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator from Minnesota and I were engaged in a hearing of the Committee on Agriculture, and we left the hearing to come to the floor to find out if the bill could be considered at this time. The Senator from New Jersey and the majority leader

agreed. May I ask the Senator from Ohio to furnish those figures for which I have asked? Is he in a position to furnish the figures as to the amount of that material coming into the country? I do not know whether there would be any objection from the candy manufacturers. I am concerned with soap manufacturers, for instance.

Mr. BRICKER. I shall be glad to read from this letter. I read the following paragraph:

As you know, the confectionery industry is dependent on many foreign oils which are not produced domestically. To us coconut oil is vital. At present there is no limitation on its importation, but there has been considerable pressure exerted to get the Secretary to include coconut oil on the restricted list.

I think that is pertinent information. Those are all the facts that are stated here. That is the basic fact.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the information relative to the amount of coconut oil and coconut products which would be needed by candy manufacturers could be ascertained in conference, and the question could be dealt with in conference.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator. I call his attention to the fact that this is a Senate bill, and unless the House accepts it without amendment, it will go to conference. In conference the records and the figures should be available. It would be my suggestion that if the bill goes to conference, the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Minnesota and others interested attend the conference. I am fearful, however, that there may not be a conference, and that is why I asked the questions about the figures, because I certainly want them printed in the RECORD so that the House would know of them, and there could be no criticism. I can see that coconut oil can be used for other things than the making of candy.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the fear I have of permitting coconut oil and coconut products to come in without any restriction is that their importation would militate against flaxseed and soybeans and all manner of fats and oils. I believe it is quite important that we try to ascertain the amount needed for the candy manufacturers, and then give consideration to such an amount, and to exclude the excess, because a tremendous volume of fats and oils is now held by the Commodity Credit Corporation, and in the event we admit an unlimited amount of imports of coconuts and coconut products we will not relieve the Commodity Credit Corporation of the tremendous responsibility they have now in connection with the surplus oils and fats they have had to acquire under the support program.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Colorado was on his feet, and I yield to him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. MAYBANK. I ask unanimous consent that I may have 5 minutes more.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina asks for 5



minutes addition to discuss the bill. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Does the amendment of the Senator from Ohio exclude everything in the bill except what was in the bill a year ago?

Mr. BRICKER. Yes; it merely continues for the next year the provisions of the law passed a year ago.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Where does the amendment start, if I may ask?

Mr. BRICKER. It starts in line 5, page 2, after the word "Government", and excludes all the rest, and limits the power of the President to matters which are "essential to the acquisition or distribution of products in world short supply or (b) essential to the orderly liquidation of temporary surpluses of stocks owned or controlled by the Government."

Mr. MILLIKIN. The remainder is stricken out?

Mr. BRICKER. The remainder is stricken out. This came about, the Senator will recall, because of the fact that there has been too high a price placed on the linseed oil, and the production in the Argentine had become so extensive that combined with the surplus piled up here, it was becoming competitive with all sorts of oils and fats.

Mr. MILLIKIN. What was the source of the other of the provisions put in the bill; who suggested them?

Mr. BRICKER. I do not know from whom the suggestion came.

Mr. MAYBANK. The suggestion came from the Department of Agriculture, but the interest the Committee on Banking and Currency had in the bill was, as the Senator from Minnesota has said, that it was our desire to protect the Commodity Credit Corporation in the large stock of flaxseed they have now. The Senator from Minnesota introduced a bill on the other side of the aisle, and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] on this side. I think the bill of the Senator from Minnesota provided for an extension of 1 year, and the bill of the Senator from Iowa provided for an extension of 2 years. We made the provision 1 year. We want to do away with the controls as fast as we can.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, when this matter was brought up before the committee the suggestion was made that we were continuing for only 1 year the law as it is.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is correct.

Mr. BRICKER. And the other provision was written in by the staff afterward, and I did not know about it until it came to the floor.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator is correct. I told him earlier that I was only too pleased to accept the amendment. I am concerned primarily with the tremendous quantities of coconuts which might be bumped here. My desire was to protect the soybean and cotton and flaxseed producers.

Mr. BRICKER. It is not possible to make very good candy out of cottonseed, I suggest.

Mr. MAYBANK. I agree with that, of course.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the bill I introduced was merely to extend the controls for another year. I did not have in mind any other congressional action.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator is correct. The committee determined on 1 year.

Mr. THYE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I should like to invite attention to the fact that in the additional matter included there are some implications which I do not believe serve the purposes desired, which might open up an extended debate. For example, there is a reference to the general agreement on tariffs and trade to which the United States is a party. It has been understood that we would come to that some day and meet it properly, but that we were not going to have references to it in connection with minor legislation.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator is eminently correct.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I notice there is a reference to "unforeseen developments." That is a highly controversial phrase connected with our whole tariff program, and I wanted to make very sure that there was no intention on the part of the committee to insist on that kind of thing in conference.

Mr. MAYBANK. There is none whatsoever.

Mr. BRICKER. When the committee considered the bill, this language was not in it.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator is correct. I assure the Senator from Colorado that the provision as to the unforeseeable future, and other like matters, will not be in the bill.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I withdraw my objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration en bloc of the amendments of the Senator from Ohio? The Chair hears none, and the question is on agreeing to the amendments en bloc.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. JUAN ANTONIO RIVERA AND OTHERS

The bill (H. R. 5051) for the relief of Mrs. Juan Antonio Rivera, Mrs. Raul Valle Antelo, Mrs. Jorge Diaz Romero, Mrs. Otto Resse, and Mrs. Hugo Soria, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard, and the bill will be passed over.

WILLIAM LAWRENCE TAN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5541) to amend Private Law No. 463, Seventy-sixth Congress, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That, for the purpose of the immigration and naturalization laws, the alien, William Lawrence Tan, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of December 1, 1934, at the port of Honolulu, T. H.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act for the relief of William Lawrence Tan."

MRS. TOMO NONQUE ROSEVEAR III

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 7047) for the relief of Mrs. Tomo Nonque Rosevear III, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, in line 7, after the name "Rosevear", to strike out "III.", and in line 8, after the name "Rosevear", to insert "III."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

PATENT TO WILBUR J. SCOTT

The bill (S. 3029) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Wilbur J. Scott, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue a patent in fee to Wilbur J. Scott for the following-described lands in the State of Montana: The northeast quarter and the north half of the southeast quarter of section 34, township 2 south, range 28 east; lot 4 of section 18, township 4 south, range 33 east, and the southwest quarter of the southwest quarter of section 21, township 6 south, range 32 east, Montana principal meridian, and containing approximately three hundred seventeen and eighty-six one-hundredths acres.

OAHE DAM—SETTLEMENT CONTRACTS WITH SIOUX INDIANS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5372) to authorize the negotiation and ratification of separate settlement contracts with the Sioux Indians of Cheyenne River Reservation in South Dakota and of Standing Rock Reservation in South Dakota and North Dakota for Indian lands and rights acquired by the United States for the Oahe Dam and Reservoir, Missouri River development, and for other related purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, jointly with the Secretary of the Interior, representing the United States of America, are hereby authorized and directed to negotiate contracts containing the provisions outlined herein separately with the Sioux Indians of the Cheyenne River Reservation in South Dakota and with the Sioux Indians of the Standing Rock Reservation in South Dakota and North Dakota, through representatives of the two tribes appointed for this purpose by their tribal councils.

SEC. 2. The contracts made pursuant to section 1 of this act shall—

(a) convey to the United States the title to all tribal, allotted, assigned, and inherited lands or interests therein belonging to the Indians of each tribe required by the United



States for the reservoir to be created by the construction of the dam across the Missouri River, in South Dakota, to be known as Oahe Dam, including such lands along the margin of said reservoir as may be required by the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, for the protection, development, and use of said reservoir: *Provided*, That the date on which the contract is signed by Chief of Engineers, United States Army, and the Secretary of the Interior shall be the date of taking by the United States for purposes of determining the ownership of the Indian tribal, allotted, and assigned lands conveyed thereby to the United States, subject to the determinations and the payments to be made as hereinafter provided for;

(b) provide for the payment of—

(1) just compensation for lands and improvements and interests therein, conveyed pursuant to subsection (a);

(2) costs of moving the members of each tribe who reside upon such lands out of the proposed flooded area; and

(3) costs of relocating and reestablishing Indian cemeteries, tribal monuments, and shrines located upon such lands;

(c) provide that just compensation for the lands of individual members of such tribes, who reject the appraisal covering their individual property, shall be judicially determined in proceedings instituted for such purpose by the Department of the Army in the United States district court for the district in which the lands are situated;

(d) provide a schedule of dates for the orderly removal of the Indians and their personal property situated within the taking area of the Oahe Reservoir within the respective reservations: *Provided*, That the Chief of Engineers shall have primary and final responsibility in negotiating concerning the matters set out in the foregoing paragraphs (a) and (b) hereof;

(e) provide for the final and complete settlement of all claims by the Indians and tribes described in section 1 of this act against the United States arising because of construction of the Oahe project.

Sec. 3. To assist the negotiators in arriving at the amount of just compensation as provided herein in section 2 (b) (1), the Secretary of the Interior or his duly authorized representative and the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, or his duly authorized representative shall cause to be prepared an appraisal schedule on an individual tract basis of the tribal, allotted, and assigned lands, including heirship interests therein, located within the taking areas of the respective reservations. In the preparation thereof, they shall determine the fair market value of the lands, giving full and proper weight to the following elements of appraisal: Improvements, severance damage, standing timber, mineral rights, and the uses to which the lands are reasonably adapted. They shall transmit the schedules to the representatives of the tribes appointed to negotiate a contract, which schedules shall be used as a basis for determining the amount of just compensation to be included in the contracts for the elements of damages set out in section 2 hereof.

Sec. 4. The specification in sections 2 and 3 hereof of certain provisions to be included in each contract shall not operate to preclude the inclusion in such contracts of other provisions beneficial to the Indians who are parties to such contracts.

Sec. 5. (a) The contracts negotiated and approved pursuant to this act shall be submitted to the Congress within 18 months from and after the date of enactment of this act.

(b) No such contract shall take effect until it shall have been ratified by act of Congress.

Sec. 6. Nothing in this act shall be construed to restrict the orderly prosecution of the construction, or delay the completion of

the Oahe Dam to provide protection from floods on the Missouri River.

Sec. 7. When electric power is available from Oahe Dam project, the said tribes and the members thereof shall have equal rights and privileges on an equal basis which are accorded the persons, cooperative associations, and others by the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 and all acts amendatory thereof or supplemental thereto as fully, as if said tribes and members thereof were named in said Rural Electrification Act of 1936.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. DOUGLAS subsequently said: I ask unanimous consent that the Senate return to the consideration of Calendar No. 1744, House bill 5372.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That bill has previously been passed.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, what is the bill, please?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 5372), Calendar No. 1774, to authorize the negotiation and ratification of separate settlement contracts with the Sioux Indians of Cheyenne River Reservation in South Dakota and of Standing Rock Reservation in South Dakota and North Dakota for Indian lands and rights acquired by the United States for the Oahe Dam and Reservoir, Missouri River development, and for other related purposes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate reconsider the vote by which that bill was passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, personally I have no objection; but it seems to me the matter should be brought up when the author of the bill, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND], is present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Arizona is about to come to the floor. I believe he is in the cloakroom at the moment.

I see that the Senator from Arizona is now returning to the floor.

Mr. President, in view of the fact that I was called out of the Chamber at the time when this bill was passed, I wish to ask unanimous consent to have action on the bill held up until the next call of the calendar, until some of us have time to go into the terms of the proposed agreement.

I am informed that the terms of the proposed agreement are substantially less favorable to the Standing Rock Indians, with relation to the Oahe Dam, than were the terms given to the Fort Berthold Indians with relation to the Garrison Dam. Yet the two situations are very similar.

I wonder whether the Senator from Arizona would be willing to have this matter held in abeyance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would remind the Senator from Illinois that he can make a motion to have the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I shall so move if necessary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair was not suggesting that such a motion be made.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I certainly would not want to prevent any Senator from having an opportunity to consider the bill. So I would agree to the unanimous-consent request.

However, I wish to state that those who are affected are very much concerned about the bill and are anxious to have it passed. The terms of the bill are not less favorable, may I say to the Senator.

The only objection made was that some persons would like to have more favorable terms in regard to power. However, the committee did not think they should be more favorable, but felt that the proposed agreement should be made on the same conditions as previous agreements.

However, Mr. President, if the Senator from Illinois wishes to have the bill go over at this time, I certainly would have no objection to having his request agreed to in order that he may have more time to consider the bill.

I believe that when he does consider the bill further, he will not wish to delay its passage, because it is important that negotiations commence. I point out that there are merely to be negotiations. The Indians will be able to refuse to accept the terms. However, if the matter were to go to condemnation, it is thought that the Indians then would get much less than they would be entitled to. For that reason we wish to have them able to negotiate rather than to have to resort to some other means.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Illinois that the Senate reconsider the vote by which House bill 5372 was passed.

Is there objection?

Without objection, the vote by which the bill was passed is reconsidered, and the bill is before the Senate.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I suggest that the consideration of this bill be postponed until the next call of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois object to the further consideration of the bill?

Mr. DOUGLAS. At this time I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection being heard, the bill will be passed over.

CARE OF CHILDREN COMMITTED TO BOARD OF PUBLIC WELFARE

The bill (S. 927) to provide that children be committed to the Board of Public Welfare in lieu of being committed to the National Training School for Girls; that the property and personnel of the National Training School for Girls be available for the care of children committed to or accepted by the Board of







81<sup>ST</sup> CONGRESS  
2<sup>D</sup> SESSION

# S. 3550

---

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JUNE 13, 1950

Referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency

---

## AN ACT

To continue for a temporary period certain powers, authority, and discretion for the purpose of exercising, administering, and enforcing import controls with respect to fats and oils (including butter), and rice and rice products.

1     *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*  
2     *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*  
3     That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, title III  
4     of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended, and the  
5     amendments to existing law made by such title shall con-  
6     tinue in effect until July 1, 1951, for the purpose of author-  
7     izing and exercising, administering, and enforcing of import  
8     controls with respect to fats and oils (including oil-bearing  
9     materials, fatty acids, butter, soap and soap powder, but  
10    excluding petroleum and petroleum products and coconuts

1 and coconut products) and rice and rice products, upon a  
2 determination by the President that such controls are (a)  
3 essential to the acquisition or distribution of products in world  
4 short supply or (b) essential to the orderly liquidation of  
5 temporary surpluses of stocks owned or controlled by the  
6 Government: *Provided, however,* That such controls shall  
7 be removed as soon as the conditions giving rise to them  
8 have ceased.

Passed the Senate June 8 (legislative day, June 7),  
1950.

Attest:

LESLIE L. BIFFLE,

*Secretary.*



81<sup>ST</sup> CONGRESS  
2<sup>D</sup> SESSION

**S. 3550**

---

## **AN ACT**

---

To continue for a temporary period certain powers, authority, and discretion for the purpose of exercising, administering, and enforcing import controls with respect to fats and oils (including butter), and rice and rice products.

---

JUNE 13, 1950

Referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency





CONTINUING FOR A TEMPORARY PERIOD IMPORT CONTROL AUTHORITY WITH RESPECT TO FATS AND OILS, AND RICE AND RICE PRODUCTS

---

JUNE 16, 1950.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

---

Mr. SPENCE, from the Committee on Banking and Currency,  
submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H. R. 8737]

The Committee on Banking and Currency, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 8737) to continue for a temporary period certain powers, authority, and discretion for the purpose of exercising import controls with respect to fats and oils, and rice and rice products, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

GENERAL STATEMENT

Public Law 155, Eighty-first Congress, continued authority under title III of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended, with respect to exercising, administering, and enforcing import controls on fats and oils (including oil-bearing materials, fatty acids, butter soap, and soap powder but excluding petroleum and petroleum products) and rice and rice products, to July 1, 1950. This bill would continue such authority for a further limited period, namely, to July 1, 1951.

With respect to fats and oils, such import-control authority appears desirable to protect farmers' marketing of the oilseed crops and to facilitate the orderly liquidation of surpluses (principally linseed oil and flaxseed) owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The world's oil situation continues to show improvement. World production of 22,018,000 short tons of oil or fat equivalent in 1949 was approximately 5 percent over 1948 production and for the first time since the end of hostilities, exceeded the prewar level (1935-39 average 21,794,000 short tons). However due to population increases,



per capita consumption has not attained prewar levels, the deficit being estimated at approximately 2 million tons. Geographic distribution is considerably altered from prewar days due to different rates of recovery of production in different areas. United States production in the year beginning October 1949 is estimated at 5.95 million tons compared with average production of 4.35 million tons in the 1935-39 period. International trade in fats and oils in 1949 amounted to just over 5 million tons compared with more than 6.5 million tons on the average from 1935 to 1939.

During the war, American farmers were encouraged to produce urgently needed flaxseed, from which linseed oil is produced, through a high support price which reached a level of \$6 a bushel. The planted acreage increased from the 1937-41 average of 2.3 million acres to 5 million acres in 1948. Last year despite a drop in the support price for the 1949 crop to \$3.99 per bushel, Minneapolis basis, the planted acreage increased slightly to 5.2 million acres. However, unfavorable growing conditions in 1949 reduced production to 43.7 million bushels or about 20 percent less than in the previous season. On April 10, 1950, a support price for the 1950 crop was announced at \$2.82 per bushel, Minneapolis basis, which was equivalent to 60 percent of parity as of April 1. The 1950 planted acreage is estimated at 4,000,000 acres or about a one-fifth reduction from 1949. Yield from the 1950 indicated planted acreage on the basis of 1944-48 average yields, would amount to about 36,000,000 bushels of flaxseed which would produce about 600,000,000 pounds of linseed oil, allowing for provision for seed for the following crop. Domestic disappearance approximates 500,000,000 pounds a year. As of April 30, 1950, the Commodity Credit Corporation held in inventory (including contracts to purchase) 467,000,000 pounds of linseed oil acquired at a cost of \$130,000,000. In addition it held 12.2 million bushels of flaxseed acquired at a cost of \$77,100,000 and had loans outstanding of \$34,400,000 secured by 9.2 millions bushels of flaxseed.

During the hearings, witnesses representing the candy and baker's trades appeared in support of an amendment to exclude coconut oil from the import control authority of the act. They pointed out that coconut oil was a necessary ingredient in their businesses for which there is no satisfactory substitute. Approximately 15,000,000 pounds of coconut oil and butter are used in candy manufacture per year. Figures for 1947 show that the soap industry used 511,000,000 pounds, the margarine industry 21.2 million pounds, the shortening industry 86.5 million pounds, and all other industries 111.4 million pounds. No import duty on coconut oil is imposed under the authority of this act and the price (including the 3 cents a pound processing tax) leaves it 3 to 4 cents a pound above competing oils in general industry use. In view of the fact that candy and baking use, of coconut oil represents so small a proportion of total industry use, the committee deemed it unwise to specifically exempt coconut oil from authority of the act.

A representative of the Commodity Credit Corporation assured the committee that in the normal course of coconut oil importations there would be no question about sufficient coconut oil being available for use by the candy and baking trades. Coconut oil is the most important single commodity from the standpoint of volume, entering into world trade in fats and oils. In the 1935-39 period coconut oil (in-



cluding oil equivalent) accounted on the average for 1,290,000 short tons of the average 6,530,000 short tons fats and oils total. Of 1949 world trade in fats and oils, coconut oil accounted for an estimated 1,040,000 short tons of the 5,017,000 short tons total. The forecast for 1950 is that world coconut oil exports will amount to 1,000,000 short tons of the 5,000,000 short tons of fats and oils (including equivalents) moving in world export trade.

With respect to rice and rice products, temporary continuance of import control authority appears desirable to assure that foreign producers of rice will not divert output to this country for dollars at the expense of other regions of the world where rice is still in short supply and urgently needed to meet minimum food requirements.

The legislation does not attempt to write permanent legislation pertaining to the problems of domestic production, marketing, or foreign trade of the commodities subject to the provisions of this act. Instead it proposes a 1-year extension of an existing law which appears desirable in meeting certain postwar problems which continue to exist. It may be recalled under the terms of the law, which this bill would extend for 1 year, that such import controls may only be exercised upon a determination of the President that they are essential to the acquisition or distribution of products in short world supply or essential to the orderly liquidation of temporary surpluses of stocks owned or controlled by the Government. Provision is also made "that such controls shall be removed as soon as the conditions giving rise to them have ceased."

#### CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with paragraph 2a of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, changes in existing law made by the bill, as introduced, are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in italics, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

#### PUBLIC LAW 155—81ST CONGRESS

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, title III of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended, and the amendments to existing law made by such title shall continue in effect until [July 1, 1950] July 1, 1951, for the purpose of authorizing the exercising, administering, and enforcing of import controls with respect to fats and oils (including oil-bearing materials, fatty acids, butter, soap and soap powder, but excluding petroleum and petroleum products) and rice and rice products, upon a determination by the President that such controls are (a) essential to the acquisition or distribution of products in world short supply or (b) essential to the orderly liquidation of temporary surpluses of stocks owned or controlled by the Government: *Provided, however,* That such controls shall be removed as soon as the conditions giving rise to them have ceased.*





81ST CONGRESS  
2D SESSION

# H. R. 8737

[Report No. 2272]

---

## IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JUNE 6, 1950

Mr. SPENCE introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency

JUNE 16, 1950

Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

---

## A BILL

To continue for a temporary period certain powers, authority, and discretion for the purpose of exercising import controls with respect to fats and oils, and rice and rice products.

- 1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
- 2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
- 3 That the Act of July 1, 1949 (Public Law 155, Eighty-
- 4 first Congress), is amended by striking out "July 1, 1950"
- 5 and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1951".

Union Calendar No. 812

81ST CONGRESS  
2d Session

**H. R. 8737**

[Report No. 2272]

---

---

# **A BILL**

To continue for a temporary period certain powers, authority, and discretion for the purpose of exercising import controls with respect to fats and oils, and rice and rice products.

---

---

By Mr. SPENCE

---

---

JUNE 6, 1950

Referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency

JUNE 16, 1950

Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed







# House Calendar No. 223

81<sup>ST</sup> CONGRESS  
2<sup>D</sup> SESSION

## H. RES. 680

[Report No. 2367]

---

### IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JUNE 28, 1950

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following resolution; which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed

---

## RESOLUTION

1       *Resolved*, That immediately upon the adoption of this  
2 resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve  
3 itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State  
4 of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 3550) to  
5 continue for a temporary period certain powers, authority,  
6 and discretion for the purpose of exercising, administering,  
7 and enforcing import controls with respect to fats and oils  
8 (including butter), and rice and rice products. That after  
9 general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and con-  
10 tinue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and  
11 controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member  
12 of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall

1 be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At  
 2 the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amend-  
 3 ment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the  
 4 House with such amendments as may have been adopted  
 5 and the previous question shall be considered as ordered  
 6 on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage with-  
 7 out intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

House Calendar No. 223

81ST CONGRESS  
2D SESSION

**H. RES. 680**

[Report No. 2367]

## RESOLUTION

Providing for the consideration of S. 3550, a bill to continue for a temporary period certain powers, authority, and discretion for the purpose of exercising, administering, and enforcing import controls with respect to fats and oils (including butter), and rice and rice products.

By Mr. SABATH

JUNE 28, 1950  
 Referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed







score years, four decades, Paul Leach has gained the respect and love of everyone in this body, and, indeed, all of official Washington.

It is a privilege and a pleasure to congratulate him, and the Chicago Daily News as well, on the occasion of his fortieth year with the same newspaper. Paul Leach is an honor to his profession and to the city of Chicago.

I know that all of you who know Paul Leach must agree with me that he is a gentleman of high ability and fair-mindedness, and that, further, you will concur in all that I have, with deference, said about him.

(Mr. SABATH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, as a newspaper publisher and as a lifelong friend of Paul Leach, I am happy to join in the tribute being paid him by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH]. Paul Leach is an exceptionally able newspaperman and a great American.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, whenever I have occasion to refer to the occupants of the Press Gallery, a certain stanza of verse invariably comes to my mind, the author of which I do not presently recall:

Some day I'll pass by the Great Gates of Gold,

And see a man pass through unquestioned and bold.

"A Saint?" I'll ask, and old Peter'll reply:

"No, he carries a pass—he's a newspaper guy."

Paul Leach, who is celebrating this month his fortieth year with the Chicago Daily News, is one of the ablest, finest and best "newspaper guys" it has been my privilege to know. Knowing him as I do, he does not need a pass to get him anywhere he may wish. I have never known him to take an unfair advantage of anyone or any situation. As a newspaper correspondent, Paul has always reported the news accurately and objectively.

In the fullest sense, Paul Leach has upheld the highest traditions of the fourth estate. The mere fact that he began with the Chicago Daily News 40 years ago as a sports reporter and has continued with that same great newspaper to be today its chief correspondent speaks more eloquently than any words of mine the merit of the man.

In his newspaper career, Paul has filed copy from every State in the Union. Since 1920 he has covered every national election as correspondent for the Chicago Daily News.

With this broad experience and inexhaustible knowledge of governmental affairs, Paul writes a weekly news analysis column for the four Knight newspapers—the Detroit Free Press, the Chicago Daily News, the Akron Beacon Journal and the Miami Herald.

And I think Paul has another accomplishment that ought to be mentioned. Shortly after he began his newspaper career he acquired a helpmate, who has been a constant source of inspiration to

him. Their son and daughter have brought four grandchildren to the family circle. The boy served with distinction as an infantry captain in the Pacific during the last war, and the daughter's husband was a Navy officer in the submarine service.

In more ways than one, the Paul Leach family has made a real contribution to this great country of ours. I pay my respects to all of them. I congratulate the Chicago Daily News. To Paul, I would say, as Emerson at one time said: "The reward of a thing well done, is to have done it." And Paul has accomplished what is accomplished by few men. I am proud to claim him as a personal friend.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN) there were—ayes 389, noes 0.

So the resolution was unanimously agreed to.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, since it seems there is no opposition to the joint resolution, and since no money is involved, I call up the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 453) authorizing the President to invite the States of the Union and foreign countries to participate in the First United States International Trade Fair, to be held at Chicago, Ill., August 7 through 20, 1950, and ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

*Resolved, etc., That the President of the United States is authorized to invite by proclamation or otherwise, or in such manner as he may deem proper, the States of the Union and all foreign countries to participate in the First United States International Trade Fair, to be held at Chicago, Ill., from August 7 to 20, 1950, inclusive, for the purpose of exhibiting industrial products; machinery, equipment, supplies, and engineering; and the exhibiting of the newest developments in metals, plastics, chemicals, oils, textiles, and other manufactured products; and bringing together buyers and sellers for promotion of foreign and domestic trade and commerce in such products.*

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "all foreign countries" and insert "foreign nations."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### IMPORT CONTROLS ON FATS AND OILS AND RICE AND RICE PRODUCTS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 680 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 3550) to continue for a temporary period certain powers, authority, and discretion for the purpose of exercising, administering, and enforcing import controls with respect to fats and oils (including butter), and rice and rice products. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.*

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order the bill S. 3550, and it has been agreed by the Committee on Banking and Currency that S. 3550 will be offered as a substitute for H. R. 8737, so that the same could be passed without any delay. The Committee on Banking and Currency has agreed to that so that the bill will not have to go to conference. The only question that has arisen was the question of coconut oil and coconut exemptions.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. SPENCE. I do not think we agreed to the provisions of the bill. We agreed that it would be advisable to adopt the rule in order that the matter might be considered by the House.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. This is not a substitute or anything of that sort. We simply gave a rule permitting the Senate bill to be brought up at this time rather than the House bill. The difference between the House bill and the Senate bill is that the Senate bill excludes from the provisions certain coconut oil, which the House bill included. The agreement was made to go ahead with the Senate bill.

Mr. SPENCE. That is correct.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. So this is an original resolution.

Mr. SPENCE. It is an open rule and the bill is subject to amendment.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. But it is to expedite action that you are taking up the Senate bill because the dead line is tomorrow night at midnight.

Mr. SPENCE. That is right.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to address the House in support of House Joint Resolution 453. As a Chicagoan I, of course, take considerable pride in the initiative Chicago is taking in organizing the First United States International Trade Fair. But as an American who is vitally interested in seeing every possible step taken to encourage a sound foreign trade, I feel that every possible encouragement should be given to the First United States International Trade Fair.



It was my honor and pleasure to sponsor this resolution in the Committee on Foreign Affairs. A special subcommittee consisting of myself as chairman, my colleagues, Mr. MANSFIELD, of Montana, and Mr. JAVRS, of New York, considered this resolution and unanimously recommended that the resolution be reported favorably. The full committee concurred in the subcommittee's recommendation and also reported the resolution unanimously.

The House should understand fully the scope of this resolution. A fair like the one in Chicago usually requires legal authorization to permit exhibitors to bring in their exhibits and dispose of them by proper procedures outside the customary operations of the customs laws. This authority was given by the Congress on May 18, 1950, in Public Law 517.

The resolution now before the House authorizes the President to invite foreign nations and States of the Union to participate. It involves no financial obligation to the Government. What the resolution proposes is to lend the prestige of the United States to the fair by authorizing the President to issue invitations.

Although the purpose of the resolution is simple, the principle involved is of great importance. The expressed aim of the fair is to bring buyers and sellers together so as to encourage commercial relationships, the sale of goods, and the business contacts so necessary to good trade relations.

The passage of this resolution would give the President an opportunity to apprise the world of the importance of the fair and its part in those actions for which this Government stands. Good trade relationships are the lifeblood of commerce, and the encouragement of a healthy foreign trade is essential to this country and the nations of the world.

The trade fair emphasizes this point in encouraging buyers and sellers primarily, and governments as well.

It should be noted that the fair in Chicago is the "First United States International Trade Fair." Others will be held in years to come. It is most important, therefore, that the first one have the full support of the Government and people of the United States. The passage of this resolution will give that necessary support. I urge its adoption.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution. The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 3550) to continue for a temporary period certain powers, authority, and discretion for the purpose of exercising, administering, and enforcing import controls with respect to fats and oils—including butter—and rice and rice products.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House

on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 3550, with Mr. GRANGER in the chair,

The Clerk read the title of the bill. By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] is recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Banking and Currency reported out the bill H. R. 8737 and went before the Rules Committee to obtain a rule and made our argument in behalf of the rule on that bill. The Rules Committee, however, with peculiar generosity, gave us a rule on a Senate bill. The question that then presented itself was whether or not we would accept the rule. We have accepted the rule because it is absolutely essential if these controls on fats and oils are to continue that some affirmative action be taken before tomorrow night.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Under what stretch of the imagination does rice come under fats and oils?

Mr. SPENCE. It comes under the bill; whether it comes under a strict definition of "fats and oils" is immaterial. Rice is expressly mentioned in the bill, and the question as to whether it is a fat or an oil or neither would not make much difference. The only difference between these bills is that the Senate excluded coconut oil from the quantitative controls which the President may exercise; the House bill included it.

This power is given to stabilize our economy, balance our international trade, and to protect these agricultural commodities, and incidentally to protect the stocks of these commodities which have been obtained by the Commodity Credit Corporation in order to support their prices. I think it is very essential that these controls continue. The last time we continued them for 3 years. This bill continues the controls by the President for one additional year.

The question is whether you want coconut oil controlled or decontrolled. I will admit that there are some advantages in accepting the Senate bill, because if there is a delay and this matter goes to conference and no decision is rendered by tomorrow night, which would be impossible, all of these controls are lifted. It is a matter of a good deal of importance to those sections that produce cottonseed oil, soybean oil, and peanut oil. When I gamble I like to gamble with my own property—not the other fellow's. I do feel I should not gamble with his interest in this legislation, and I am willing to be guided largely by the opinion of my colleagues who represent the producers of these products. I think there is a real peril if you do not pass the Senate bill because there will necessarily be a conference and there may be a delay; and the President cannot control the importation of these commodi-

ties if there is a delay, for the power to control them will expire tomorrow night.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. The Senate bill just extends the present law?

Mr. SPENCE. Yes.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. The only difference is with regard to the one item, coconut oil, one commodity.

Mr. SPENCE. That is true.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Is coconut oil controlled or decontrolled at the present time?

Mr. SPENCE. I understand that no controls have been exercised over coconut oil for the last 3 years.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. What was the reason for the elimination of coconut oil in the Senate bill, allowing its importation, allowing it to stay decontrolled?

Mr. SPENCE. That is a question that must be answered by the President.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. It has been delayed up to this time so that we are now in the position of either having to swallow the fly or get no soup.

Mr. SPENCE. We are between the devil and the deep blue sea right now, and the question is whether you want to take a chance on having all controls lifted by prolonging the discussion, or whether you will accept the Senate bill which will continue these controls; and you may be assured that they will continue for 2 years.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. What assurance does the gentleman have that if we pass the bill the Senate will take action on it before tomorrow night?

Mr. SPENCE. This is a Senate bill and if passed will go to the President for his approval.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I understood the gentleman to say that the Senate bill provided for an extension of the present law for 2 years.

Mr. SPENCE. Yes.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. As I read this bill, it runs to July 1, 1951.

Mr. SPENCE. I made a mistake. It is 1 year. I confused this with the last bill we passed here today.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I introduced a bill to extend it for 2 years and I had hoped that is what it would be; but under the circumstances I do not see how we can do anything about it.

Mr. SPENCE. This is an extension for 1 year. I would like to correct that.

Mr. Chairman, the Members are familiar with the operation of these controls and what they have done. The matter is submitted to the House.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.



Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. In case anything should happen to this bill, under section 22 of the AAA Act the President has the same powers that he has under this act?

Mr. SPENCE. I am not too familiar with that, but he has some powers of control. How far they go I do not know.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Under section 22 he would have to do it by issuing an executive order, which would be public information to everybody, but under these provisions it is done through the back door and other countries and other peoples do not know about it.

Mr. SPENCE. I think probably he has some powers of that kind, but how far they go I do not know.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. As I understand it the existing law which we are continuing by this bill gives the President discretionary authority and is not a mandatory proposition?

Mr. SPENCE. I do not think the Congress ever issues any mandate to the President. He is head of a coordinate branch of the Government and the powers we grant him are always discretionary.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. But the gentleman and I have seen much legislation here that requires the doing of certain things; instead of saying "may do certain things" it is provided that "he shall do certain things," but this bill gives the President discretion?

Mr. SPENCE. It gives the President discretionary authority, yes.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. He can put on an embargo?

Mr. SPENCE. It is quantitative control. It can be done by embargo or by any method he wants to pursue as long as it is quantitative control.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

(Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, this bill is just one of the regular merry-go-rounds that takes place between the State Department, the Department of Agriculture, the Banking and Currency Committee and so forth and so forth.

In the first place, under section 22 of the AAA Act the President has this power now. In the second place, it does not make much sense to pass this bill yet turn around and let coconut oil come in, because that is the biggest import. It looks to me as if in presenting this bill all we are trying to do is to deceive ourselves or deceive somebody else because without the coconut oil provision in there there is not much use passing this bill. Coconut oil, it so happens, is recognized as the best vegetable oil there is so far as oleomargarine is concerned and so far as these other edible foods are concerned. In this bill provision is made that it is exempted.

Having been here as many years as I have and having watched the peanut oil people and the cotton people always looking after their own interests as they have been all these years, I cannot un-

derstand their submitting to a piece of legislation like this that allows coconut oil to be exempted. Coconut is the origin of the coconut cow. The dairy industry is already faced with catastrophe.

We are faced with another problem and that is the matter of the coconut cow. They can skim milk and coconut oil and sell it in competition with evaporated natural milk. As near as I can find out there were at least 10 times as much of that made last year as was made 10 years ago. It is just one more step downward for the dairy industry. I figure that the Eighty-first Congress has done enough to the dairy industry of this country for one session without being a party to ruining the evaporated milk industry of this Nation, which is a very important part of the dairy industry in many parts of our country.

Still, regardless of whether it is going to take a day or two longer, as far as I am concerned, I do not want to vote for this bill and give special privileges, if you please, to the coconut oil people, and I am sorry to see the soy bean people and the cottonseed people take the position that they want to have these coconut oil interests have the advantage over them because this kind of legislation is not based on fairness or equity or justice. I am not going to spend any time on the rice business at all; it has nothing to do with fats and oils. Rice has a tariff, it has good protection, and it could come under section 22. I am personally getting tired of having people come on the floor and telling about the wonderful features of reciprocal trade treaties, and every chance they get come in and ask for special privilege legislation which they ask for in connection with rice and other special privilege crops. I represent a district that tries to farm their farms and not the United States Treasury. In all the years I have been here, I have never asked for one thing for the farmers of my district that I did not want every other farmer in the United States to have, and it gets rather discouraging to see this double talk and this hypocrisy, of people going around and talking for reciprocal trade treaties and what a wonderful thing it is, and then talk about gadgets or legislation that sets it up for the few at the expense of the many. This rice gadget is another one of them.

So, the first thing we should do is to take out that provision for coconut oil. I am willing to pass up the rice, because it is an insignificant crop anyway. I realize that under this program, sure, we will stop the importation of butter, but you are not stopping the importation of butterfat. Millions and millions of pounds of butterfat are coming in here in other forms, in the form of cheese, which is a good deal more important than the rice industry of this country. We brought in 32,000,000 pounds of butterfat last year, and it caused just as much trouble as far as disturbing our domestic economy is concerned as if it came in in the form of a pound of butter.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I was going to mention the cheese proposition. If this bill should be amended at all, it should be amended to include cheese, and exclude cheese from coming in.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. It should have cheese included. As far as that is concerned, under section 22, how do you think we got the embargo on cotton coming into this country? By executive order. How about the embargo on wheat? That was done by executive order. There is no reason why this whole situation cannot be handled the same way if and when they want to do it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. McKINNON].

Mr. McKINNON. Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to oppose this bill, although there are certain things about the inequity of the situation that I think should be borne in mind. I think all of us subscribe academically to the principle of free trade, but we all realize from a realistic standpoint that it cannot be flung open and operated completely without undermining our own economy. A number of us from the West sit here and watch certain commodities that are politically strong come in and get exemptions on certain articles they are interested in. I have no particular quarrel with that. It is only natural that we represent our commodities to the best of our ability, but I think this should be borne in mind, too, that complete free trade can hurt the little commodities just as much as it can hurt the big commodities. When you start making exceptions on the big powerful commodities, even though you do have the political strength to do it, we must realize that if we are going to have free trade we should not ask the little commodities to bear the complete brunt of a free-trade policy.

Out in our section of the country we have such items as lemons that are suffering pretty heavily now from imports from Italy. Our producers of canned fish are suffering from imports from South America. They are particularly threatened in the future by imports from Japan. The imports of Japanese canned tuna practically ruined our industry on the west coast in the thirties.

We have almonds and walnuts and fruits, and they are greatly damaged by the completely free-trade policy. Yet we do not have the political strength to protect ourselves. In passing this sort of a bill we are going to give an exception to certain items. I simply ask the other Members of the House to give consideration also to the little commodities that are likewise being hurt by this sort of policy. If it is right to make an exception on certain of the more politically powerful commodities, then I think we should also take into consideration some of the smaller commodities that are being damaged by a free-trade policy.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKINNON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. I concur in the gentleman's argument, and mention one or



two products that affect my people very vitally in this reciprocal-trade program. One is the almond industry. A large part of it is in my home county. They are all individual, rather small farmers, and they are in continual jeopardy because of this agitation to modify the schedules. Another is wine. We have hundreds of wineries out in my area. Whenever you hurt the wine industry it percolates right down to the grape crop, and many of these producers have very small ranches, as the gentleman knows.

It seems to me when we go before these reciprocal trade committees we do not get any comfort whatever in presenting our arguments. They are just cold to our appeal. Once you wreck the wine industry you have wrecked the whole grape industry of California. We raise 3,000,000 tons of grapes a year, and it goes into thousands and thousands of families.

I want to compliment the gentleman on the argument he is making.

Mr. McKINNON. I thank the gentleman. I might also point out that when it comes to the almond grower, the walnut grower, and the citrus grower, these men are in the position that it takes several years to bring an orchard into bearing. If in one or two particular years the crop does not bear out they take the loss. They cannot transfer over into another crop. They are stuck with their groves. The same thing applies all through the West, and I think it applies to the citrus industry in Florida. We cannot make a quick transfer. Those things should be borne in mind as we write these reciprocal trade treaties. They should protect the little man, the little farmer who invests. It means everything to him, although his investment may be small compared to the national economy.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKINNON. I yield.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. The gentleman is making an excellent statement. I think it is a good thing to have attention focused on the problem of the special commodities he has mentioned. At the same time, I am pleased that he is not going to oppose the bill; that is, the plight of some commodities should not restrain the Congress in its effort to protect those that apparently this legislation is logically designed to protect.

With reference to some of the basic crops, I might add that the purpose of this bill is not limited to protection of American producers. I am thinking of rice, for example. I am not an expert in this field, but my district is close enough to the rice area that I think I can speak authentically on this point. Without these controls there might be a movement of rice to some local markets away from countries that need it. It is in consideration to some extent of the dietary and other standards rather than price considerations that the controls on rice should be extended.

I am glad that the gentleman developed the points on trade problems. He knows that many of us on the Committee on Banking and Currency are concerned on this score. I agree with him

that we have not reached a solution. Free trade is an ideal that must be pursued, but it must be pursued with consideration for the little producers.

Mr. McKINNON. I am glad to have the gentleman's statement. Since he is a good Baptist deacon, naturally I would expect him to agree with the principle of the Golden Rule.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. HULL].

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, unless this bill is amended by striking out "and coconuts" on page 1 and on page 2, as well, as "and coconut products," I shall feel constrained to vote against it regardless of the consequences. This House cannot be held responsible for this unwarranted situation.

There is no more dangerous element introduced into our economy than this matter of foreign oils in competition with the oils produced in our own country and in great competition with our dairy industry. The bill, if it is passed in its present form, will remove all import controls over coconut oils. It will allow large volumes, possibly millions of tons, to be imported into this country.

We know that because of the recent war there have not been so many new coconut plantations brought to bearing. But they will be, and there will be millions of tons of this coconut oil brought to this country to displace the cottonseed oil, peanut oil, soybean oil, and other oils produced in this country. I have a copy of a letter from the American Soybean Association addressed to the chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee, which reads as follows:

HUDSON, IOWA, June 10, 1950.

HON. BRENT SPENCE,  
Chairman, Banking and Currency  
Committee, House of Representatives,  
House Office Building, Wash-  
ington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SPENCE: It is our understanding that your committee will start consideration of a bill adopted by the Senate last week, basic purpose of which was to extend the import controls on fats and oils for an additional period of time. We also understand that this bill includes an amendment adopted in the Senate specifically exempting coconut oil from these controls.

The American Soybean Association favors the continuation of import controls on fats and oils, but we violently oppose the Senate bill, which specifically exempts coconut oil. With this exemption the bill becomes meaningless. The exemption defeats the very purpose for which the bill was written. It gives advantage to the major oil import, discriminating against all others. It is our contention that this exemption should be removed from the bill, and that it should then be passed and become law. Representing the major source of edible vegetable oil in the United States, soybean growers have more at stake than any one other group of producers. We would prefer nonpassage of import controls to passage of a bill containing special-privilege controls, legislation of the type sent to your committee by the Senate after adoption of the Bricker amendment.

We urge your committee to take immediate action to remove from the bill this exceedingly preferential and damaging provision. We further urge you to give immediate impetus to passage of the bill after removal of this exemption for coconut oil, thus con-

tinuing authority for import controls on all fats and oils on their present basis.

We further ask that this letter be presented to your committee and that it be placed in the record of testimony on this subject.

Respectfully yours,

AMERICAN SOYBEAN ASSOCIATION,  
By GEO. M. STRAYER,  
Secretary-Treasurer.

Mr. Chairman, that, in brief, is the sentiment of the farmers engaged in the business of raising soybeans in the Northwest and millions of other farmers as well. Many of you will remember that in the last few years and throughout the recent war the Government has paid subsidies to get the farmers to raise soybeans. That was done during the war and the acreage was increased in certain States, including Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Wisconsin, to some extent Minnesota, and in some other States. The soybean acreage was increased accordingly.

Now we are in competition with other vegetable oil interests. At this time a large part of the coconut oils imported into our country is made into soap. The soap monopoly which controls about 80 to 85 percent of all the soaps made and sold in this country is in control of the coconut oil trade of the world, one of those European cartels that we hear so much about. It is one of those corporations that apparently reaches out farther and farther as time goes on in order to compete with the American vegetable oil products.

Very recently, in the past year or so, \$600,000,000 of American money has gone to Britain and Africa to develop many millions of acres of plantations which will produce vegetable oils and be in competition with soybean and cottonseed oils and all the other oils of our country. Of course, the idea is to extend the power of the cartel which manufactures such a large part of the products from vegetable oils, including probably two-thirds the oleomargarine made in our own country.

I shall offer an amendment at the proper time to strike out "and coconuts," in line 10 on page 1, and "coconut products," in line 1, page 2, from this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. HULL] has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, in fairness to the Committee on Banking and Currency and its chairman, I am obliged to state that they did appear before the Committee on Rules and did desire a rule on their bill H. R. 8737 before the law expires tomorrow. We felt that if we should grant a rule on the House bill it would be a different bill than the bill which the Senate already passed. The Senate passed a bill excluding coconuts and coconut products and petroleum and petroleum products. In the hope that we would eliminate the appointment of conferees and perhaps delay the consideration of this legislation, the majority of the Committee on Rules felt a rule should be granted on the Senate bill in lieu of the House bill.

I do not wish you to understand that originally Chairman SPENCE of the Com-



mittee on Banking and Currency was willing to agree to it, but he was in this position, namely, that he must take the Senate bill or no bill at all, because, if we had granted a rule on the House bill, the chances are there would have been no legislation because of serious disagreement and the law would have expired. So the Committee on Rules felt that the only thing to do was to grant a rule and let the Banking and Currency Committee agree to take the Senate bill instead of no bill at all.

As to the complaints that have been made by my neighbors and friends from Wisconsin, I want to say this: You gentlemen have not been injured or hurt, as you maintain. Of course, I appreciate your efforts in behalf of the people of your district and the great State of Wisconsin, but Wisconsin, the farmers, and the dairy people of that State have been more prosperous, notwithstanding the legislation you complain of, than ever before in the history of our country. I hope they will continue to be prosperous, but I hope too that they will reduce their high prices on milk, cheese, and cream which we the public are obliged to pay.

Now, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. HULL] complains about soya beans. May I call attention to the fact that in Illinois we grow large quantities of soya beans, more than the farmers in the State of Wisconsin. In the western section and the northern section of Illinois we have the finest farms and the finest dairies, and raise a great deal of soya beans; I have not heard a single soya-bean grower complain, because soya beans today are selling at \$3 and as high as \$3.15. Consequently, they cannot complain that they are suffering due to legislation when they can get \$3, \$3.10, or \$3.15 for soya beans, as I said before. I realize the farmers themselves do not get it all. I know that this high price that has been brought about by speculation will not inure to the benefit of the farmers, but still they will have their portion of the high price, and that they are entitled to.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I think it is for the best interest of our country that this law be extended; and the only way it can be extended, because we are going to adjourn today, is to adopt the bill as passed by the Senate. I know there are men in the Senate who are interested in our country and in the farmer; not perhaps to the extent that the gentleman from Wisconsin is, but there are some men over there who at times are interested in the farmers of the Nation.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. If 85 percent of the vegetable oil which came into the United States this last year was coconut oil, would the gentleman still be in favor of this legislation or not?

Mr. SABATH. I do not know the percentage of coconut oil that comes into this country.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Of the total oil, I mean.

Mr. SABATH. But I understand that the bakers and the candy makers are very much interested in obtaining some of these coconuts and coconut oil at a price which will permit them to remain in business. Because of the protests from these two industries that came to the Committee on Rules and to the members of that committee we felt that we would safeguard their future and also bring about legislation that would extend this law which is about to expire tomorrow.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TALLE].

(Mr. TALLE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Chairman, I want to express keen regret at the fact that the Committee on Rules did not see fit to grant a rule on the House bill, because in the House bill there are no words that would have aroused the controversy we are spending our time on now. I think it was a mistake, and I shall point out why.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TALLE. Yes; briefly. My time is very short.

Mr. GROSS. Would the world come to an end if we failed to pass this bill today and the law expired for a few days, a week or so?

Mr. TALLE. I will deal with that in a moment. I thank the gentleman.

What may occur in the event that we leave the gates wide open as far as coconuts and coconut oil are concerned? Let me call attention to the statement of a distinguished scientist, Dr. John L. Coulter, in connection with the hearings on the House bill the 12th of June. He pointed out the following:

The fact is that imports during the past 3 years, 1947 to 1949, have averaged more than during any other 3-year period in our history.

So you see the imports are increasing. In 1947 the imports amounted to 877,000,000 pounds.

I inquired about the conditions of production and I found that they are much improved in the areas where coconuts and coconut products are produced. War damages have been repaired, and revolutionary forces are not so active as formerly. Production is going ahead at a rate higher than prewar.

The next question is: Who are the users? Some of the testimony given to the Banking and Currency Committee was sweetened because it came from the confectionery industry, but if you will examine the hearings you will discover that as of 1947, 70 percent of the coconuts and coconut oil imported into the United States was used not by the candy people, not by the bakery people, but by the soap industry. The controversial words in this bill—S.3550—relate principally to the interest of the soap industry in a foreign product which competes with products produced by our own people. American producers should have first claim on the home market.

What is the difficult position we are in? We are on a spot? Here is the situation: Suppose we pass the Senate bill

and the gates are opened wide. Oil will flow in to compete with our domestic producers. Suppose we amend the bill. Then there must be a conference of the two Chambers, and, as you know, the parliamentary situation in the two bodies is such that a conference cannot be held prior to midnight tomorrow.

As has been pointed out, existing safeguards relating to fats and oils will die tomorrow at midnight. Suppose we kill the bill? Then the safeguards will die, too.

In the last two situations, what difference does it make? Suppose we let the current law expire tomorrow and take our time about further legislation. This is what will happen: The big users, and they are the soap people, suspecting that controls might be put on imports would immediately proceed to make large contracts for supplies. All right. After those contracts were made, whatever law we might pass on the 12th of July or the 15th or 30th of July would be nullified because the contracts had already been made. So in order to protect ourselves in this awkward situation I suspect we will be better off if we pass the bill.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, my distinguished colleague from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] has pointed out that the President and the Secretary of Agriculture were granted certain powers relating to imports under the Commodity Credit Corporation Act which became law just a few days ago. The gentleman referred to section 22. It is my opinion, and I believe it is the gentleman's opinion, that if the provisions of that section are properly administered, whenever imports endanger the price of lard, butter, and so forth, or fats and oils generally, the President and the Secretary of Agriculture can stop further importation.

As I stated at the outset, I regret this sort of legislation, but I am not going to take the responsibility of removing all safeguards on the ground that the Senate bill contains a provision with which I disagree.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Chairman, I repeat that I believe we will be better off if we pass this bill. There is not sufficient time for a conference with Members of the less numerous branch of the Congress.

Inasmuch as the administration leadership is responsible for this awkward and unfortunate situation I feel that the administration should take a look at section 22 in the Commodity Credit Corporation Act, and then resolve to bolster up the weakness that is very apparent in the pending bill.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TALLE. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Did Dr. Coulter's figures show the percentage of coconut oil being imported? Nearly all of the imports are coconut oil percentage-wise?



Mr. TALLE. That may be true. Dr. Coulter testified in behalf of seven national organizations. His complete statement is in the hearings on the House bill.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Therefore, if the bill is not passed it is not going to do much harm because there is not much cottonseed oil, peanut oil, or any other vegetable oil coming into the United States, is there?

Mr. TALLE. Up-to-date figures are not available to me but production, and importation are increasing. I want to protect our domestic producers of fats and oils.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY].

(Mr. HARDY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I want to address my remarks particularly to the comment made by the two gentlemen from Wisconsin. In my opinion, their point is well taken. There is a defect in this legislation in the exemption provided for coconut oil. However, under the circumstances that confront us, I sincerely hope we will pass this legislation as it is and without amendment; otherwise we will wake up tomorrow night and we will not have any controls over these oil-bearing crops. The situation, as I understand it, is that if we do not extend this authority by passing this legislation today on July 1 we will have foreign-produced peanuts—perhaps foreign-produced soybeans—moving freely into competition with our domestic production.

On yesterday I had a telephone call from one of my constituents who is in the peanut business. He said, "I would like to know what is going to happen to this extension of the authority to control these imports. There are now in Mexico oriental peanuts which I can buy for delivery on July 1. There are also in certain foreign-trade zones, in storage, peanuts ready for immediate movement." He said he was further informed that there were orientally produced soybeans ready for immediate unloading in west coast ports. I was also informed that there are large quantities of flaxseed in Soviet-controlled ports ready for immediate shipment to this country.

Now we are faced with a problem. Unless we pass this legislation as it is, we are going to have no controls and we are going to immediately feel the effect of the elimination of these controls, and we will feel it on the following day. I think we should eliminate or find some way to eliminate this coconut-oil proposition, and I would suggest that the Committee on Banking and Currency give consideration toward further legislation which will be more equitable and might even take into account some other commodities that are involved.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Just to keep the record straight, the facts are that pretty nearly all the imports are coconut oil at the present time.

Mr. HARDY? "I understand that that is true, but the imports of peanuts would show up immediately. There was an intensive effort made only a few months back to have this restriction lifted on peanuts, and peanuts are now waiting to come in."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN].

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, this type of legislation really has the Members over a barrel. We are really forced to take it, and if we do not, then our country will be flooded with imports of foreign fats and oils and the competitive products covered by this bill. Now, it is apparent that Congress during the past, and even the Eighty-first Congress, has delegated authority to the President to say what should happen on imports and exports; in fact, we learned here only this week that the President possesses the power to declare war, or get the country into a state of war, or send our troops into war and bypassing Congress. This legislation is about on a par with that. We do not know today, if we pass this bill, whether the President will continue embargoes and quotas which have been in effect or will be in effect up until tomorrow night. He may or he may not; it is in accordance with his discretion. We will find ourselves in the situation which we are in where we are really forced to take this bill or take nothing and then trust to the President that he will try to protect the American producers of this country.

Now, what has happened in the case of butter? Well, the President under discretionary authority given him by Congress—I did not vote for it—reduced the duty on butter from 14 cents a pound to 7 cents a pound. He did that in January of this year under agreements made over in France when they had a trade conference. So the duty on butter has been cut in half.

Last year in August and September the President urged all these countries like France and Denmark and other countries who are getting our grants and gifts to devalue their currencies, and most of them did, by 30 percent. It really knocked out the 7-cent duty we have on butter, and the other tariff duties that have been cut by the President under his discretionary authority. Butter today can be laid down in New York from any country in the world, duty and transportation paid, at less than 50 cents a pound, and here we have a support price of 60 cents a pound, with the Government buying a great deal of the butter produced in the surplus-producing areas of the country, like the States of Iowa and Minnesota.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. The fact is that butter is coming into this country by the millions of pounds.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. It is not coming in yet, because we still have this law that is in effect and will remain in effect until 12 o'clock tomorrow night. When the President cut the duty on butter he fixed a quota on imports of 60,000,000 pounds a year that can come in under the 7-cent duty, which is about two times as much butter as we have imported at any time in the history of our country during the past 25 years.

Mr. JENSEN. That is what I said; it is coming in.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Yes; it will come in, unless we pass this bill and continue the law for another year. I am satisfied that the President will not exercise the authority he has under section 22. He did not do so on potatoes. Our market will be flooded with butter. This means that the Commodity Credit Corporation will have to step into the market and buy more and more American butter, that will go into storage in this country, to provide a market for the butter that is shipped here from foreign countries. So we are facing a reality here when we deal with this legislation.

Mr. JENSEN. In addition to the smack that we took on the oleo bill.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is true.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Granting at least that the gentleman is right on his approach to butter, and all that they want to control is the butterfat that is in the butter, would the gentleman be agreeable to an amendment that would include cheese, because cheese has pretty nearly half as much butterfat in it as butter does?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I recognize that. I will say to the gentleman we should also include all kinds of cheese. We should also include potatoes. We should include eggs that are shipped in here from Communist China, and we should include hams that are shipped in here from behind the iron curtain. There are many other items that should be included in this legislation because of the authority that has been conferred by this and other Congresses on the President to use his discretionary power. So that this legislation really does not solve anything. It temporarily tries to correct an evil. I hope the day is not far distant when we can have a Congress here that will try to protect the American market for the American producers in all lines of agriculture and industry.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KEARNS. Is it not possible to have some kind of peril clause here such as we tried to have in the reciprocal trade agreements bill?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am for the peril clause. We had that in law passed by the Eightieth Congress, but that was knocked out when they



passed the Reciprocal Treaty Act last year. The peril clause would have given protection to American producers.

But I would go further than that, because when you have a peril point in tariff legislation, immediately you are up against the political situation where there is a discretionary power lodged in the President or the Commission which is to pass on it, and if the policy is continued on a free-trade basis, as we have been doing since 1934, it will not do much good. What we must have here is mandatory legislation enacted by the Congress under the power provided in the Constitution, and then the Administration will know just exactly what should be done without any question whatsoever.

I do not like to see coconuts in this bill. What are we going to do? I feel like the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TALLE]. We are just behind the eight-ball. Unless we pass this legislation we probably will not have any legislation whatsoever, and then these imports will be coming into this country, 60,000,000 pounds of butter, which will knock the bottom out of the dairy market. The Government has 150,000,000 pounds of butter now and they probably will have two hundred and twenty-five or two hundred and fifty million pounds of butter. They do not know what to do with it now. In fact, they are not doing anything to find a place for that butter, but probably with the war on, and our forces being engaged in hostilities in the Pacific, perhaps they may find some use for these surplus foods, like butter, cheese, and other products which have been accumulated under the support-price program.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. HARDY. Then the gentleman has arrived at the same conclusion I have, that the only thing we can do is to pass this bill in its present form, otherwise we will have no controls?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is right. I am glad to hear the gentleman mention that. Several Members have spoken today who voted for the reciprocal-trade program, and now they are pleading for protection. I feel, however, that we should keep the record straight and therefore I have given certain pertinent facts in regard to the reciprocal-trade program and the manner in which the Truman administration is administering the law.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LARCADE].

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Chairman, I realize that this legislation should have been presented to the House before this time, however, the fact remains that a rule was only obtained on June 16, and while the House bill would protect some of the industries that obtain in my district, as explained by the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE], since the existing law expires on tomorrow, June 30, it was found advisable to present the Senate bill S. 3550 rather than consider the House bill, for

if any amendments were made to the House bill the bill would have to be referred to a conference between the House and Senate which would have required probably some time, and in the meantime, the existing controls on the items covered would lapse, and as a result there would be great harm to some of the commodities and industries covered under the existing law.

Mr. Chairman, the Senate bill covers all of the commodities included in the House bill. However, the Senate has added a provision to make the same applicable to coconuts and coconut products, and while some of the Members have the opinion that this item should not have been included, and others that additional commodities should also be included, and have announced that they will offer such amendments, while I am sympathetic to some of the amendments, I join the chairman of our committee in asking that the bill, in order to be effective at the expiration of the present law, that is, June 30, be passed so that there will be no interim in the protection to those commodities covered in the bill. I am greatly interested in the protection provided in the bill under consideration as my district produces cottonseed oil, fats, and rice. I represent one of the largest rice-producing districts in the United States, and as an example of what may happen in the event that we do not pass the bill under consideration, and if the controls on rice should expire tomorrow—I am informed that Siam is ready to start shipping 200,000,000 pounds of rice to the United States at a price 2 cents per pound below the prevailing price of American rice. The United States consumption of rice is about 50 percent of the amount of rice produced in the United States, and since the rice to be shipped by Siam is of the lower grade, used principally by breweries, the American producers would be deprived of this market for nearly one-fourth of the American crop at one swoop.

Mr. Chairman, my good friend the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] referred lightly to the rice industry in the United States as not being of much importance. While it is true that only four States in the United States produce rice, this is one of the most important industries in my State and the other States named, and I wish to say to my friend that I consider the rice industry most important, and unless we continue these import restrictions on rice, as well as the other commodities included under the bill, my district and State and the other States will be very adversely affected from an economic standpoint. I trust the Members of the House will approve this emergent legislation.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, as it has already been pointed out, because of the parliamentary situation, and the fact that the control powers now existing on the importation of fats and oils will expire tomorrow, it is necessary that some action be taken today. I can un-

derstand that the bill does not meet the approval of all of the Membership. Possibly it does not cover some commodities which should be covered. Again, from my own point of view, it does not go far enough. I would like to see some affirmative or mandatory instructions to the administrative authorities provided in the bill, and not leave the matter entirely discretionary. The trouble is that the discretionary powers provided are not exercised often enough.

With your permission I would like to illustrate briefly what I have in mind: There is an infant industry in this country, largely in my particular area, the tung oil industry. Tung oil is primarily a Chinese product; but, due to the fact that it is a strategic war material, the industry was begun in this country following World War I. Tung oil is now one of the commodities, the importation of which can be controlled under existing law; but the fact remains that those in charge of the administration thereof have not seen fit to do anything toward stopping the importation of this cheap, inferior grade of tung oil on the domestic market in competition with the oil produced in this country.

We have, as I pointed out the other day on the commodity credit bill, an unusual situation, in fact, an almost unbelievable one. This Congress last year passed legislation making it mandatory upon the Secretary of Agriculture to support domestically produced tung oil at approximately 24 cents per pound. That support price is in effect today, and yet, we are permitting the shipment of more than 50 percent of the tung oil used in this country largely from Communist-dominated China, free of duty. It is unthinkable that we should permit these oil brokers to bring this Communist oil from China into this country at opportune moments so as to run the market down below the support price that Congress provided for domestic oil. It simply does not make sense that one agency of the Government should reach into the taxpayer's pocket to pay the support price on domestically produced oil and at the same time another agency of the Government should permit this foreign oil, produced by Communist-dominated coolie labor, to be imported and dumped upon the market so as to run the price of the domestic oil down.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that those in charge of the administration of this law will understand from the action of the Congress today and from this debate thereon that this action is a mandate to them to do something about this intolerable and nonsensical situation.

Mrs. BOSONE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the distinguished lady.

Mrs. BOSONE. I wonder if the gentleman from Mississippi, along with the tung oil and soybeans and peanuts, would mix up a little lead and zinc and copper. We from the West would appreciate that because it would help us a great deal.

Mr. COLMER. I am sure I get the full import of the lady's remarks. Unfortunately, in 3 minutes I had to confine myself to one commodity. What I am



trying to say is that I hope the Administration will use the authority that is granted it to protect this and other similarly situated industries and commodities, and thus save the taxpayers some money.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] has expired.

[Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time, 3 minutes, to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, America produces annually in the neighborhood of 10,000,000,000 pounds of fats and oils, yet in the past few years fats and oils have been coming into this country by the hundreds of millions of pounds.

It is noteworthy that up until about a year ago this Government had an embargo against the importation of fats and oils, both edible and inedible. Fats and oils were piling up in this country no end, bringing the price of all of our fats and oils away down to about 50 percent of their actual value. Lard was brought down to a point of about 15 cents below the price at which it should actually sell. Hence, it was necessary for the packer to charge more for the pork chops in order to make up the great loss which he sustained on lard. About a year ago a number of Congressmen, including myself, took this matter up with the Commerce Department; and I am happy to say that a short time afterward inedible fats were decontrolled; that is, the administration permitted the exportation of inedible fats, and a short time after that edible fats were placed on the exportable list.

Now, Mr. Chairman; I have been told that the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Sawyer, is married into the Procter and Gamble soap family. If that be the case, it is, of course, mighty nice and profitable to have very cheap fats and oils, for his folks, but mighty tough on our producers of fats and oils. If Mr. Sawyer and his family are profiting in this manner, then I think Mr. Sawyer should be investigated.

It is necessary to have coconut oil to make fine candies? The answer is "No," because many of the finest candies are made of good pure hog lard; and coconut oil is a substitute for good pure hog lard; lard is not a substitute for coconut oil. A short time ago our dairymen took a terrific jolt from the oleo combine, now our hog raisers are about to take a like jolt, from foreign producers. I ask; what next?

[Mr. CARROLL, at the request of Mr. SPENCE, was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.]

[Mr. CARROLL addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, title III of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended,

and the amendments to existing law made by such title shall continue in effect until July 1, 1951, for the purpose of authorizing and exercising, administering, and enforcing of import controls with respect to fats and oils (including oil-bearing materials, fatty acids, butter, soap and soap powder, but excluding petroleum and petroleum products and coconuts and coconut products) and rice and rice products, upon a determination by President that such controls are (a) essential to the acquisition or distribution of products in world short supply or (b) essential to the orderly liquidation of temporary surpluses of stocks owned or controlled by the Government: *Provided, however,* That such controls shall be removed as soon as the conditions giving rise to them have ceased.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: On page 1, line 9, after the word "butter", insert the word "cheese."

(Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple amendment, and I do not believe it ought to be objected to by the committee. Neither should it cause the calling of a conference, for it merely includes an item which should be included when we are considering the question of import controls on fats and oils. Cheese should be in this bill. I am offering the amendment in the hope that the committee will not object.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, without going into the merits of this amendment, the amendment will simply send the bill to conference which will take time, and inasmuch as the controls expire tomorrow night, delay will destroy the very purpose for which we have accepted the Senate bill. Should you vote for this amendment you are taking a chance of having all the controls that are in the bill lifted.

I am sorry that this condition exists, but it does exist, and we must take that fact into consideration when the amendments are offered.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that this amendment be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin) there were—ayes 31, noes 49.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HULL: On page 1, line 10, and on page 2, line 1, after the word "products", strike out "and coconuts and coconut products."

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I well realize that what the Chairman says as to the situation is probably correct, but I do not think the House of Representatives should take the responsibility of passing a bad bill because the Senate has forwarded this measure over here at this time in the shape it is in. It does seem to me that it is rather wicked to ruin the

marketing facilities for products of millions of farmers in their surplus period with the idea of catering to the demand of some big corporation lobbyist who may be back of this whole proposition. I realize if we vote for the amendment we may not cure the situation, but it is our responsibility, and I shall vote for it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. HULL].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HULL) there were—ayes 36, noes 54.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. GUILL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GUILL: On page 1, line 10, strike out "petroleum and petroleum products and."

Mr. GUILL. Mr. Chairman, I do not know why line 10, excluding petroleum and petroleum products, was placed in this bill unless it was so that we could continue importing oil from Saudi Arabia, South America, or any other foreign country. But I would like to make this statement that, notwithstanding what pictures appear in Life magazine and other publications, everyone in Texas is not a millionaire, and all the oil and gas wells in Texas do not produce and spray oil all over the countryside. We have many little wells down in Texas producing four and five barrels a day or less. We have thousands of people working in the oil industry, and some of them are being laid off today because of the fact that we are importing so much oil from foreign lands. We do not mind letting them import some oil, but let them import only as much as we export. We are not only being hurt in Texas, but you are being hurt in Pennsylvania, West Virginia, and many other States. I think it is time we gave these small, independent oil people some protection. I do not mean the big boys; I am not worrying about them. They can look after themselves. They operate over a period of many years, but the little man who operates today pays his stuff out in 5, 6, 7, or 8 years.

As I said, I am not certain of the reason behind the specific omission in line 10, but I suggest we consider striking it out. I respectfully ask this House to give this amendment some thought.

I personally think our own small producers deserve more consideration from this House than producers in distant places beyond the seven seas.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, petroleum and petroleum products have been excluded from controls for the last 3 years, and we left the law as we found it in that respect.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to use this time just to ask the chairman or some member of the committee some questions. I asked some of them a while ago on the floor and off the floor about whether or not petroleum and petroleum products were excluded from import controls, and I was assured that this bill did not have anything in the world to do with petro-



leum and petroleum products, even though this language in line 10 is there. It does seem that it has got something to do with it; is that right?

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, that is right. It is excluded from controls now.

Mr. TACKETT. And this bill just keeps it excluded?

Mr. SPENCE. It is excluded from controls now. The law remains as it now exists.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TACKETT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. If it is excluded now, why is it in here? Why is it necessary to write it into this legislation?

Mr. TACKETT. I understood that President was authorized to make agreements with various nations and countries concerning the importation of oil and gasoline, but under this bill he has no authority to deal with anyone, and I think the President of the United States ought to have some authority to deal with these countries that are exporting gasoline and oil into the United States and putting these small oil people out of business.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TACKETT. I yield to my colleague from Arkansas.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I believe the gentleman understands the situation. If he wishes to support the gentleman from Texas, of course, that is his privilege, but as the chairman has indicated, for 3 years Presidential controls under the War Powers Act have been nonexistent, and this bill is to continue the controls over the other commodities. It does not affect petroleum or petroleum products. It neither takes from or adds to existing powers. These agreements that the gentleman refers to are being made, as I understand, under other executive powers. I hope the committee will not disturb this legislation because no testimony was offered along the line suggested by the gentleman from Texas, and it would certainly complicate our situation. It would undo all of the accomplishments of the committee so far in the consideration of the basic idea.

Mr. TACKETT. I may say to my colleague from Arkansas that the House bill did not have this provision in it, and for that reason no one came before his committee to testify. This is something the gentleman's committee did not know anything about this morning. If it is in the House bill, I cannot find it.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. If the gentleman will look in that portion of the report, on page 3, that complies with the Ramseyer rule he will find the answer. I want to answer the gentleman's question as intelligently as I can. I am simply trying to emphasize the fact that this is an extension of existing law.

Mr. TACKETT. I think the gentleman is right. I do not doubt that, but I do not want any provision going in here that will preclude the President under some other authority from dealing and making agreements with other countries.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. The gentleman is right, and he can have every assurance on that point, that this will not impair other laws with reference to the importation of petroleum. I assure the gentleman of that.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield so that I may ask a question of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. TACKETT. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Assuming the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas was adopted, what would be the effect of it?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I am not sure. I want to be very careful here. I do not know that it would affect the President's powers. The point I wish to make is this, that since we are forced in view of the fact these controls end tomorrow to adopt legislation in the form adopted by the Senate then of course we can make no predictions at all regarding the continuation of these controls if amendments are added.

Mr. TACKETT. What I would like to find out is this. Petroleum is not under control now.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. TACKETT. If this is adopted will it bring it back under control?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. No. I believe I answered the question when I said that it leaves it to the President's discretion. The effect of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas would be to leave it to the President's discretion. I do not intend to enter into a discussion of the merits of the controls over petroleum or the wisdom of any executive orders and policies with reference to it. I have simply pointed out that if we are to accomplish what we desire to do here with reference to the other commodities that were considered by the committee we will simply have to avoid a conference with the Senate, by rejecting the gentleman's amendment, whatever its merits, independently considered.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TACKETT. I want to be sure that petroleum would be regulated. That is the main thing I am after. Knowing that this bill is so important, is there any reason why we waited until the day before the law is to go out of existence, and then have to rush in here and pass this bill, and then say we have to take this or take nothing? Is there any particular reason for that?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I could say with reference to that, if the gentleman implies that the Committee on Banking has been derelict, that this report was filed on June 16, and we did not get a rule until yesterday.

Mr. TACKETT. Did the candy companies and the soap companies have anything to do with his coming in here with

this Senate bill rather than the House bill?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I think, of course, the answer to that would have to be given by members of the Committee on Rules, but, in all fairness, of course, it is a matter of public information that the confectioners are favorable to the Senate action.

Mr. TACKETT. To the Senate bill; that is right.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I do not see anything to be gained by entering into a discussion on that point. But the users of coconut oil, of course, are largely the confectioners and the candy manufacturers and the baking interests. They have presented their case vigorously. I am not questioning that.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TACKETT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. Those of us who are concerned over the importation of these tremendous quantities of oil, amounting to some 821,000 barrels a day, feel that if we could strike out the word "excluding" in line 10, and insert the words "including petroleum and petroleum products", we would be giving protection to the independent producer and the small operator against this tremendous influx of foreign oil.

Mr. TACKETT. I agree with the gentleman except for one thing. They say if we do not pass the bill today it will not do any good if it is passed tomorrow. I want to ask just one more question with reference to that. If the bill is passed today with some amendments and it is necessary to go to conference, would it hurt anything if the bill became law 2 or 3 days later?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TACKETT. I yield.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I come from an oil-producing State and that I am certainly not indifferent to the interests of the oil producers. I know of course that the gentleman's district is an oil-producing district. But the question cannot be resolved on the basis of the merits or demerits of any Presidential controls over the imports of petroleum or petroleum products as far as this legislation is concerned. I give the gentleman that assurance.

With reference to the specific question the gentleman asked me, and speaking as one member of the committee—if any amendments are added to this legislation, I could not make any predictions regarding the action of the other body. It is obvious, in view of the history of this legislation that if any amendments are added a conference is inevitable and the future of this legislation is entirely unpredictable. It would be impossible for us to give the House



any assurance that the controls which the vast majority of us understand are necessary in the case of these other oil products, would be continued. Since this legislation does expire tomorrow, it seems to me on that basis we are justified in voting down these amendments. That was my only purpose in making that point.

Mr. GUILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TACKETT. I yield.

Mr. GUILL. I would like to ask the gentleman one question along the line of the question asked by my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, whether striking out the word "excluding" and inserting the word "including" would give protection to the independent producers and the small operators in the oil industry.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. No, in my opinion it would not. And may I point out to the gentleman that insofar as the prevention of importation of petroleum products is concerned, and the prevention of the disruption of the American market, in which the gentleman is interested, the powers of the President are exercised under other laws which are not involved here.

I believe, if I may say so, and I know the gentleman from Texas is seeking to protect the interests of his people, that his recourse would be with executive agencies and with other committees now investigating the oil import situation not the Committee on Banking and Currency and not by typing his proposal onto this bill.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TACKETT. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLSON. May I point out to the gentleman from Arkansas that there is nothing in this bill which has anything to do with petroleum products. All this bill concerns is fats and oils, and that is vegetable oils and fats. It has nothing to do with petroleum. I agree with the gentleman from Texas as well as the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I am an old Yankee protectionist. I do not believe in free trade or anything. But there is nothing about that in this bill. All that this bill involves is vegetable oils. They have never used that discretion which they had to set up a quota on coconut oil imports. We do not have any in this country. We do not raise any and we are not in competition with them. But it came from the Senate that way. As has been pointed out by the chairman of the committee and the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS] nothing is going to be hurt if we put this through, because it has never been used anyway. If we have to go to conference, it will never be passed.

Mr. GUILL. We have been told that these things are not going to be used, time and again; that this had to be crammed down our throats by the veto of the Kerr bill. I think it is time we had some laws where we knew what was going to happen, instead of saying, "We will never use it."

Mr. NICHOLSON. In reply to the gentleman, because it has never been done we think it never will be, has not

anything to do with the bill before us. We are asked to vote for a Senate bill that has been sent in by the Rules Committee, and that is all we can vote for.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NICHOLSON] has expired.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words in order that I may get the floor in support of the amendment so ably presented by the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. GUILL].

I want to commend the distinguished gentleman from Texas for bringing this important matter to the attention of the Membership of this House, this question of importation of oil and oil products.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. GUILL] has made every effort he could during the short period he has been in Congress in an attempt to secure legislation that would help curb this ever increasing importation of oil.

I have had considerable experience also in trying to secure legislation on this subject matter, but up to this time, I regret to say, have met with little success. Why the administration should oppose the curbing of importation of oil and oil products to the detriment of the independent oil producer, is difficult to understand. I believe if his amendment were adopted some effort would be made on the part of administrative officials to curb the ever increasing importation of oil and oil products. This House ought to give attention to the problem that has been so well portrayed by the gentleman from Texas. This is a problem that not only concerns the State of Texas, a great producer of oil, but it also affects other States in the Union who have a similar problem.

I say to you that unless action is taken with regard to this matter, a good many independent oil producers will go out of business and many workers will go on the unemployed list, all because this country has allowed an over importation of oil and oil products into the United States, from foreign countries.

I trust the membership of this Committee will give its support to the amendment that has been so ably presented by the distinguished Member from Texas [Mr. GUILL].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield to the gentleman who has manifested great interest in this problem.

Mr. GAVIN. I cannot see any reason why this would not be proper in this bill. Here is an opportunity for the Representatives of the oil States who have been suffering from these tremendous imports of foreign oils to control the imports.

Mr. REES. And the gentleman knows the little attention we have received from the committees in this Congress where we have appeared requesting legislation on this subject matter.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. POULSON. Does not the gentleman from Pennsylvania realize that this

is the way the administration gets over all their program? They wait until the last minute and then come in and use the stock answer, "We have got to put it over or it will expire."

Mr. REES. That is indeed, very unfortunate, because undoubtedly those in charge must have known that this act was going to expire. Surely, they should have brought it here in sufficient time so that it could have the proper consideration to which it is entitled.

The production of crude oil is not only one of the basic industries in the State of Kansas and Texas but it is one of the important and basic industries of this country. I feel that this Congress should provide legislation that would protect the domestic oil producing industry against the ever increasing imports of crude petroleum presently playing havoc with the oil producing industry in this country.

While the market at home is shrinking, imports of crude petroleum are increasing every month and every year. I call your attention to some facts that I think are of extreme importance to this committee and to this Congress.

During the period from 1936 to 1940, the average importation of crude oil and refined products was 153,000 barrels per day. During the war the average imports amounted to approximately 200,000 barrels daily. In 1946 imports were 370,000 barrels. In 1947, 437,000 barrels. In 1948 513,000 barrels per day, and at the end of 1949 importations reached the high of 580,000 barrels. I do not know what the imports are for 1950, but I understand they are now running at the rate of 750,000 barrels per day.

Now let me call your attention to the manner in which these importations have affected the production of oil in the State of Kansas. It is estimated by those engaged in the production of crude oil that in the year 1949 there was a decline in the State's daily production of approximately 25 percent. The decline was from 300,000 barrels of oil daily to a low of 245,000 barrels, or a loss of 65,000 barrels of oil per day of the market demand for Kansas produced oil.

The situation is similar to that of Texas and other oil-producing States. It is estimated that the loss to the economy of the State of Kansas alone amounted to approximately \$30,000,000 last year. Think what it amounts to in the great State of Texas. I would remind you that this loss is not sustained by big oil companies, because 70 percent of the oil produced in the State of Kansas is by independent producers, and the loss is distributed not only among the producers themselves but among land owners, where oil is produced, and especially among employees who produced the oil.

It is estimated that the reduction in the sale of oil in the State of Kansas alone represents the employment of approximately 5,000 people engaged in various phases of oil production.

I would like to call your further attention to the fact that although 2,500 new oil wells were completed in Kansas in 1949, the output is less than it was in 1948. I think you understand that our oil production is held down on a pro rata



basis. In other words, under proration agreement all oil production is given a chance for the market on an allocated basis so that the oil production in our State, as well as in other States, is extremely small compared with the potential production of these wells.

Mr. Chairman, this is an economic problem. The hundreds of thousands of persons who earn their living by drilling and operating oil wells, who operate pipelines and refineries, have a direct and vital interest in the production of crude oil. It affects the farmers who share in the proceeds of the sale of oil. It affects the merchants in the hundreds of oil-producing communities throughout the country.

It does not make sense that the economic benefits of the domestic oil industry of the State and Nation should be transferred to foreign lands and foreign dictators and to a small group of powerful companies, which, though domiciled in the United States, give the appearance of willingness to sacrifice domestic welfare and increase their foreign position. It cannot be right that our own independent producers should be required to further cut their allocations or go out of business while our Government sanctions increases in imports of oil from foreign countries.

We should have legislation that will curb the importation of crude oil and its products. These importations should be on a quantitative restriction basis, and should be limited to not more than the amount needed to supplement domestic production.

(Mr. REES asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GUILL].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN: Page 2, line 1, after "rice products", insert "potatoes, cheese, hams."

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield before he starts?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield briefly.

Mr. HARDY. I just wanted to call attention to the gentleman's consistency. He admitted a while ago that an amendment would kill the bill and that the bill ought to be passed.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Minnesota desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Yes, if the Chair please.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard on the point of order because I think the amendment is germane. Furthermore, I want to keep some of these products out. That ought to make it germane. I call the Chair's particular attention to the fact that on page 2, line 1, rice and rice products are included. All that I am doing is to add additional products. Certainly rice and rice products are food; and the commodities I mentioned, potatoes, cheese, Polish hams, eggs from Communist China, are all food products and are in line with rice and rice products. Even butter is mentioned in the bill. I think the chairman should find that the amendment is germane.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. GRANGER). The Chair is prepared to rule.

The body of the bill as well as the title enumerates commodities in addition to fats and oils. Rice is mentioned. It would be in order to add other commodities.

The Chair overrules the point of order. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I thank the Chair for that wise ruling.

Mr. Chairman, the reason I have offered this amendment is to have the RECORD show that large imports of potatoes, cheese, eggs, and hams are coming into this country. Approximately 32,000,000 pounds of cheese have been imported into the United States at a time when we have a support price program for cheese in this country. The Commodity Credit Corporation now owns 63,000,000 pounds of cheese. We imported 32,000,000 pounds in the last year. For every pound of cheese that comes into this country as long as we have the support price program you will find that the Commodity Credit Corporation has to buy 2 pounds of American cheese.

We have heard a great deal about potatoes during the past 2 years and particularly now, since April 7, 1949, when the famous utopian Brannan plan was presented to the Congress. During the past year approximately 10,000,000 to 12,000,000 bushels of potatoes have come in here from Canada. Canadian growers of potatoes have been encouraged to increase their production by 30 percent so they could ship potatoes into the United States while we have a support price on potatoes in this country. Nothing has been done either under this law or under section 22 to stop these imports. The consequence is that the Government has had to buy 2 bushels of American potatoes for every bushel of potatoes imported into this country to carry out the support program.

Then we have had hundreds and hundreds of thousands of pounds of eggs which have come into this country from Communist China that are flooding this market at a time when we have a support price program for eggs. In fact, we are encouraging the Communists in China to produce more eggs to ship into the United States in competition with the eggs produced by American producers.

Oh, yes; they all come from behind the iron curtain. They send Polish hams

into this country, sell them for dollars, take the dollars out of the United States, which go into the coffers of Russia with which to buy implements of war to be used against us. They may be using them against us even now over in Korea this very minute, as the gentleman from Iowa suggests.

I think something ought to be done about this matter, especially at a time when we have a support-price program. There certainly is no reason in the world why we should permit the importation of eggs, hams, and other commodities from behind the iron curtain in order to furnish Russia with a market in this country, using the money that we give them for their products sold in competition with American-produced products to buy war materials to be used against our soldiers and our sailors over in the Far East or in any other part of the world.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. If the gentleman's amendment is agreed to will it lessen the support-price program to the taxpayers of the country?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Oh, yes. I think it would materially cut the cost of our support programs. The farmers throughout Iowa, Wisconsin, and Minnesota are getting from 20 to 26 cents a dozen for their eggs. Of course, we are paying from 50 to 60 cents a dozen for them in Washington. If we are going to have a support program why, then, we should be consistent about it in supporting prices only in this country. They are not doing that now. They are supporting the price of eggs and potatoes for the entire world. So it goes.

I do not suppose this amendment will pass.

Mr. CURTIS. Oh, yes; it will.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will it? I am glad to hear the gentleman say he will support it because we ought to protect our American producers in the United States as well as the Treasury.

I hope the gentleman from Maine will support my amendment because he represents one of the biggest and finest potato-growing areas in this country next to Minnesota, and he knows what it is to have this kind of competition coming at a time when we need this protection. In the 1948 crop his State sold millions of bushels of potatoes to the Government, at the same time the Canadians were shipping them in here and taking the market away from American producers.

I am offering this amendment to keep the record straight and ask for a vote.

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

(Mr. FELLOWS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Chairman, the Maine potato gets the publicity, and cotton, corn, and peanuts get the cash. I am very glad to say a word on behalf of Maine potatoes. We do raise some sixty to seventy-five million bushels, and, strange as it may sound, the Canadians



are permitted each year to import some eleven to fifteen thousand carloads into the United States. They want to give us the Brannan plan; a scheme by which the producer gets the top price, the consumer pays the bottom price, and they make up the difference to each other in taxes. That is the New Deal scheme. So I am going to support this amendment because if we are going to have support prices and at the same time destroy the support program by bringing in some 15,000,000 bushels of foreign potatoes, we will in the end destroy ourselves.

I think it would be a very good thing to put this amending language in here so that we can read it, and it will not be left to some agency to use its own judgment. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] is an excellent thought, and I hope it will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FELLOWS and Mr. GAVIN) there were—ayes 32, noes 51.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GAVIN: Page 1, line 9, strike out "but", and in line 10 strike out the word "excluding" and insert the word "including."

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I make the point of order that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania is not germane.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule. It is the same proposition on which the Chair ruled previously. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, a further point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SPENCE. I make the point of order that the question has been decided. An identical amendment has been voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. I will say to the gentleman from Kentucky that this is a different amendment entirely. It has not been determined by the House.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the bill and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, will the Chair state how many amendments are at the desk?

The CHAIRMAN. For the information of the gentleman, this is the only amendment on the desk.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

(Mr. GAVIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple amendment. We have heard a great deal lately about the tremendous imports of foreign oils which have now reached the gigantic figure of 821,000 barrels a day. This has had a terrific impact on the small independent producer of oil who is making the very fight of his life for his existence against this tremendous flood of imported oil. This amendment just simply changes the word "excluding" to "including", so that it will read: "for the purpose of authorizing and exercising, administering, and enforcing the import controls with respect to fats and oils (including oil-bearing materials, fatty acids, butter, soap and soap powder, including petroleum and petroleum products.)"

So now those who have been clamoring for the administration to effect some curb on imports of petroleum or some tariff medium to protect the small independent producer, here is an opportunity to express their thinking and their opinion so as to give that protection which is so necessary and essential to the small producers throughout the Nation, if he is to stay in business. If we fail to curb these oil imports, and dampen the ambition of these men who are seeking oil to build up our reserves, and we suddenly find ourselves catapulted into a war, with these imports from Saudi Arabia, Asiatic countries, and the South American countries cut off, and we have not built up our reserves in this country to meet the needs and demands of fighting a war, we will find ourselves in a very critical position. The Pennsylvania crude oil industry, in my opinion, will have a difficult time if these heavy imports of crude are permitted to come into this country. It is a stripper field and the average production is less than one-half barrel a day and is unable to compete with cheap South American or Saudi-Arabian crude.

The Pennsylvania grade crude industry has existed since 1859 and has contributed greatly to the economic growth and prosperity of the nation. However, with steadily mounting imports, it is a question how long it can survive against this severe competition. And this goes for all the small independent producers all over the United States. Legislation must be enacted to curb importation of foreign oil.

Nobody would object to a reasonable amount of crude being imported, but if the big operators can get away with 800,000 barrels a day, in 2 or 3 years I presume they will be up to 2 or 3 million barrels a day which would wreck the oil industry of this Nation, and the coal industry as well.

This is a splendid opportunity to enact legislation to enforce controls on the importation of oil. The representatives from the oil States certainly ought to be pleased to vote for this amendment. My amendment is simple, it is understandable, it is clear and concise. It is an excellent opportunity for those representa-

tives to express their thinking on this matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GAVIN) there were—ayes 22, noes 51.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, a recent publication, issued by the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston, entitled "New England, Its Economic Importance and Prospects," that has just come to my attention, carries a message that sustains the conviction I hold in common with many other New Englanders, that this great industrial and commercial area of the country is looking forward to a very bright future.

The part that New England has played as the pioneer industrial area of the United States is well-known to every American and recognized all over the world. What is not generally appreciated, is that New England today has a remarkable record of outstanding leadership in a great variety of important types of manufacture and there is little evidence that we are losing our dominant position in any number of these well-known products.

There is conclusive proof that New England's economic importance is increasing, not declining, and the census proves that it is growing in population and labor force. Personal income and bank deposits of New England citizens are sharply increasing and this is reflected in a substantial advance in the volume of retail sales, particularly in the last 10 years.

The predominance of industrial New England is indicated by the following facts, recently published by the Federal Reserve Bank. Of the total volume of the United States, New England manufactures 85 percent of wool scouring and combing; 80 percent of packaged fish; 62 percent of silverware; 61 percent of woolen and worsted fabrics; 61 percent of thread; 59 percent of newsprint paper; 57 percent of textile machinery; 56 percent of footwear cut stock; 52 percent of felt hat bodies; 50 percent of wrapper and binder cigar tobacco; 49 percent of nails and spikes; 45 percent of cutlery; 45 percent of typewriters; 44 percent of cardboard; 42 percent of hand saws and blades; 41 percent of maple sirup and sugar; 38 percent of narrow fabrics; 37 percent of ophthalmic goods; 37 percent of needles, pins, and fasteners; 37 percent of ball and roller bearings; 37 percent of jewelry; 34 percent of copper rolling and drawing; 33 percent of footwear; 32 percent of leather tanning and finishing; 30 percent of glue and gelatine; 30 percent of abrasive products; 30 percent of insulated wire and cable; 28 percent of children's vehicles; 27 percent of fine papers; 27 percent of machine tools; 26 percent of rayon and nylon broad woven fabrics; 25 percent of cut stone products.



While agriculture in New England is naturally limited by the relatively small area of the region, nevertheless, 62 percent of the cranberries and 48 percent of the blueberries raised in the United States, come from New England; and I am sure that everyone is familiar with our potato and apple crops, which have such a world-wide market.

Here are a few more pertinent facts from the same source that throws further light on New England's position at the present time. With 2.1 percent of the Nation's land area and only 6.3 percent of the Nation's population, we have 3,189,000 persons steadily employed in nonagricultural jobs, and of this number 1,337,000 workers are engaged in manufacturing, and 1,852,000 in service establishments or similar occupations.

May I also point out that the average annual income of New England citizens is \$1,500 as compared with a national average of \$1,180. The thrift of the New England people is shown by the fact that the average liquid savings for the entire area is \$1,780 per person, compared with a national average of \$1,180.

We are very proud of the good labor-management relations that have prevailed in New England for many years. We have 7.3 percent of the Nation's non-agricultural workers and yet the time lost through strikes by these workers is only 4.2 percent of the national total.

New England is growing and let these facts from official sources prove the case. According to the Bureau of the Census and other Federal agencies, in 1930 our population was 8,166,000; in 1949 it was 9,298,000; in 1930 our labor force was 3,431,000; in 1950 it is 4,239,000. This is typical of New England's growth through the years, a steady, constant growth. Lacking the spectacular percentage increases of newer sections of the country, this has largely escaped the attention of the American people, in the light of more startling increases elsewhere.

New England's industrial economy is in a state of transition, in common with other nearby industrial States, stimulated by new revolutionary technological and scientific advancements, developed since the war, and a host of new and improved products that are rapidly reaching the markets.

Old New England industries, for which we are famous all over the world, are rapidly changing their processes of production and readjusting themselves to the new order. Many new factories are being established to make new products, and while during these vital changes we are suffering a considerable volume of temporary industrial unemployment, there is every good reason to expect an unprecedented increase in production and wealth in the near future.

There is plenty of vitality in New England's industrial life and while we do not often shout our own praises from the rooftops, we do adjust ourselves to the ever-changing conditions of modern life quietly and after due deliberation and study. If economic changes reduce production and employment in any given field, this decline is almost always quickly absorbed by industrial growth in other

directions, thus we react to the immutable laws of growth. A large, well-known company moves its headquarters from Boston to California. Immediately there is raised a hue and cry claiming New England is slipping. Magazine and newspaper articles spread the tidings all over the country, but while this company was moving part of its plant away from New England, another much larger company moved into the same area, creating several times the number of jobs that were lost, with no publicity.

This is change, the symbol of growth, and we of New England and for that matter all of the great industrial areas of the eastern seaboard expect it, and eventually profit by it.

New England fights against the handicap of not being a great raw material producing area, but this disadvantage is more than overcome by the skill, stability, and intelligence of our working people, the efficiency of the servicing establishments that surround our industrial life, and the great advantage, that our cities and towns have grown up as industrial centers.

New England is attacking the problems of scarcity that restrict our growth, vigorously, whole-heartedly, and intelligently. The governments of the six New England States, aided by the New England congressional delegations, representative of both parties, are all working in the same direction to formulate plans that will take full advantage of the new sources of iron ore from Labrador. Plans are under way to bring natural gas to New England within the next year and surveys are to be undertaken at once to make full use of our water power for hydroelectric development.

When we have iron ore coming to our ports, natural gas providing inexpensive heat, and hydroelectric power stations providing us with low cost power, and all of these advantages should be available in New England in the next few years, watch New England rapidly expand in production and wealth through its 350 research laboratories and its more than 20,000 industrial plants.

Massachusetts, which has more than half of these industrial plants, and is the most widely diversified manufacturing State in the country, is already leading the way in this movement to a greater usefulness and prosperity.

(Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GRANGER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 3550) to continue for a temporary period certain powers, authority, and discretion for the purpose of exercising, administering, and enforcing import controls with respect to fats and oils—including butter—and rice and rice products, pursuant to House Resolution 680, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin moves to recommit the bill S. 3550 to the Committee on Banking and Currency with instructions to report the same back forthwith with the recommendation that in line 10, page 1, and line 1, page 2, the words "coconuts and coconut products" be stricken out; and in line 9, page 1, after the word "butter", insert the word "cheese."

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the "noes" appeared to have it.

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] A quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 72, nays 264, not voting 94, as follows:

[Roll No. 190]

YEAS—72

Andresen,	Gross	O'Hara, Minn.
August H.	Guill	O'Konski
Barrett, Wyo.	Hagen	Potter
Beall	Hale	Poulson
Bennett, Mich.	Hill	Reed, Ill.
Blemiller	Hoeven	Reed, N. Y.
Bishop	Hoffman, Mich.	Rees
Brown, Ohio	Hope	Rich
Byrnes, Wis.	Horan	St. George
Cannon	Hull	Scrivner
Case, S. Dak.	Jackson, Wash.	Scudder
Chilperfield	James	Short
Clevenger	Jennings	Simpson, Ill.
Cotton	Jensen	Smith, Kans.
Crawford	Kearns	Smith, Wis.
Curtis	Lovre	Stefan
Dague	Lyle	Stockman
Davis, Wis.	Martin, Iowa	Taber
Fenton	Morrow	Velde
Fisher	Meyer	Vursell
Ford	Miller, Md.	Weichel
Gavin	Miller, Nebr.	Withrow
Goodwin	Moulder	Woodruff
Graham	Murray, Wis.	
Granger	Norblad	

NAYS—264

Abbott	Barrett, Pa.	Bonner
Abernethy	Bates, Mass.	Bosone
Addonizio	Battle	Boykin
Albert	Beckworth	Bramblett
Allen, Calif.	Bennett, Fla.	Brehm
Allen, Ill.	Bentsen	Brooks
Anderson, Calif.	Blackney	Brown, Ga.
Andrews	Boggs, Del.	Buchanan
Angell	Boggs, La.	Buckley, Ind.
Aspinall	Bolling	Burke
Auchincloss	Bolton, Md.	Burleson
Baring	Bolton, Ohio	Burnside



Burton	Huber	Pfeifer,
Camp	Jacobs	Joseph L.
Canfield	Javits	Pfeiffer,
Carlyle	Johnson	William L.
Carnahan	Jonas	Philbin
Carroll	Jones, Ala.	Phillips, Calif.
Case, N. J.	Jones, Mo.	Pickett
Celler	Jones, N. C.	Poage
Chatham	Karst	Polk
Chelf	Karsten	Powell
Christopher	Keating.	Preston
Chudoff	Kee	Price
Clemente	Kelly, N. Y.	Priest
Cole, Kans.	Kilburn	Rabaut
Colmer	Kilday	Rains
Combs	King	Rankin
Cooley	Kirwan	Redden
Cooper	Klein	Regan
Coudert	Kruse	Rhodes
Crook	Kunkel	Ribicoff
Crosser	Lane	Richards
Cunningham	Lanham	Robeson
Davenport	Larcade	Rodino
Davies, N. Y.	Latham	Rogers, Fla.
Davis, Ga.	LeCompte	Rogers, Mass.
Davis, Tenn.	LeFevre	Rooney
Dawson	Lichtenwalter	Sabath
Deane	Lind	Sadlak
DeGraffenried	Linehan	Saylor
Delaney	Lodge	Scott,
Denton	Lucas	Hugh D., Jr.
D'Ewart	Lynch	Secret
Dollinger	McConnell	Shafer
Dolliver	McCormack	Shelley
Donohue	McCulloch	Smathers
Douglas	McDonough	Smith, Va.
Doyle	McGuire	Spence
Durham	McKinnon	Staggers
Eaton	McMillan, S. C.	Stanley
Eberharter	McSweeney	Sullivan
Elliott	Mack, Ill.	Sutton
Elston	Mack, Wash.	Tackett
Engle, Calif.	Madden	Talle
Evins	Magee	Tauriello
Feighan	Mahon	Taylor
Fellows	Mansfield	Teague
Fernandez	Marcantonio	Thomas
Flood	Marsalis	Thompson
Forand	Marshall	Thornberry
Frazier	Martin, Mass.	Tollefson
Furcolo	Michener	Towe
Gamble	Miles	Trimble
Gary	Miller, Calif.	Underwood
Gathings	Mills	Van Zandt
Golden	Monroney	Vorys
Gordon	Morgan	Wadsworth
Gore	Morrison	Wagner
Gorski	Morton	Walsh
Granahan	Murdock	Walter
Grant	Murray, Tenn.	White, Calif.
Gregory	Nelson	White, Idaho
Gwinn	Nicholson	Whitten
Hand	Nixon	Whittington
Hardy	Noland	Wickersham
Hare	Norrell	Widnall
Hart	Norton	Wier
Havener	O'Brien, Ill.	Wigglesworth
Hays, Ark.	O'Brien, Mich.	Williams
Hays, Ohio	O'Hara, Ill.	Willis
Hedrick	O'Neill	Wilson, Tex.
Herlong	O'Sullivan	Winstead
Herter	Pace	Wolcott
Heselton	Passman	Wolverton
Hoffman, Ill.	Patman	Woodhouse
Holifield	Patten	Yates
Holmes	Perkins	Young
Howell	Peterson	Zablocki

## NOT VOTING—94

Allen, La.	Fogarty	Jenkins
Andersen,	Fugate	Judd
H. Carl	Fulton	Kean
Arends	Garmatz	Kearney
Bailey	Gillette	Keefe
Barden	Gilmer	Kelley, Pa.
Bates, Ky.	Gossett	Kennedy
Blatnik	Green	Keogh
Breen	Hall,	Kerr
Bryson	Edwin Arthur	McCarthy
Buckley, N. Y.	Hall,	McGrath
Bulwinkle	Leonard W.	McGregor
Burdick	Halleck	McMillen, Ill.
Byrne, N. Y.	Harden	Macy
Cavalcante	Harris	Mason
Chesney	Harrison	Mitchell
Cole, N. Y.	Harvey	Morris
Corbett	Hébert	Multer
Cox	Heffernan	Murphy
Dingell	Heller	O'Toole
Dondero	Hinshaw	Patterson
Doughton	Hobbs	Phillips, Tenn.
Ellsworth	Irving	Plumley
Engel, Mich.	Jackson, Calif.	Quinn
Fallon	Jenison	Ramsay

Riehlman	Sikes	Werdel
Rivers	Simpson, Pa.	Wheeler
Roosevelt	Sims	Whitaker
Sadowski	Smith, Ohio	Wilson, Ind.
Sanborn	Steed	Wilson, Okla.
Sasser	Stigler	Wood
Scott, Hardie	Vinson	
Sheppard	Welch	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Garmatz for, with Mr. Macy against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Mitchell with Mr. Corbett.

Mr. Hobbs with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Rivers with Mr. Arends.

Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Patterson.

Mr. Heller with Mr. Carl H. Andersen.

Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Dondero.

Mr. Irving with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.

Mr. Sasser with Mr. Hardie Scott.

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Cole of New York.

Mr. Cavalcante with Mr. Ellsworth.

Mr. Sikes with Mr. Riehlman.

Mr. Harris with Mr. Sanborn.

Mr. Bates of Kentucky with Mr. Gillette.

Mr. Sims with Mr. Engel of Michigan.

Mr. Barden with Mr. McGregor.

Mr. Harrison with Mr. Mason.

Mr. Allen of Louisiana with Mr. Fulton.

Mr. Gilmer with Mr. Hinshaw.

Mr. Stigler with Mr. Leonard W. Hall.

Mr. Whitaker with Mr. Halleck.

Mr. Murphy with Mr. Harvey.

Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania with Mr. Jackson of California.

Mr. Breen with Mr. Jenkins.

Mr. Welch with Mr. Judd.

Mr. Dingell with Mr. Kean.

Mr. Fallon with Mr. Kearney.

Mr. Multer with Mr. Keefe.

Mr. Keogh with Mrs. Harden.

Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Jenison.

Mr. McGrath with Mr. Wilson of Indiana.

Mr. Kerr with Mr. Phillips of Tennessee.

Mr. Wilson of Oklahoma with Mr. Plumley.

Mr. O'Toole with Mr. Smith of Ohio.

Mr. Kennedy with Mr. Werdel.

Mr. Fugate with Mr. Burdick.

MESSRS. MOULDER, CANNON, GRANGER, GULL, AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, HOFFMAN of Michigan, BENNETT of Michigan, COTTON, STEFAN, HILL, and WOODRUFF changed their votes from "nay" to "yea".

Mr. JONAS changed his vote from "yea" to "nay".

The result of vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The question was taken; and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The bill H. R. 8737 was laid on the table.

## GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

## PROGRAM FOR THE BALANCE OF THE WEEK

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a brief announcement for the benefit of the Members.

It was hoped that we might be able to dispose of the program today, but it now appears that we will not be able to do so. Therefore, we will have to meet tomorrow.

There is a conference report to be taken up next; then the Puerto Rican bill. Then there is Reorganization Plan No. 24, which expires next week. Of course that is a matter of high preference. Following the Puerto Rican bill, that will be taken up. Then, following that, the security bill.

There will be some opposition to the Puerto Rican bill, and it looks as though we might not be able to dispose of this program today, so I wanted to announce that we will be in session tomorrow.

For next week, as I announced heretofore, there will be no program. Unless something of an emergency should happen, which is not expected, the Members can govern themselves with the knowledge that as of now there is no legislative program for next week.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Is it the plan of the majority leadership to finish the Puerto Rican bill today?

Mr. McCORMACK. No, not necessarily. If we can, we would like to do so; but if not, it will go over until tomorrow.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. You are going to take up the conference report first?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman spoke about Reorganization Plan No. 24. Would it not be possible to bring that up before the Puerto Rican bill? It would not take more than 20 minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, I assumed we had made an arrangement. I thought I had suggested to the gentleman from Michigan that Plan No. 24 would be called up after the Puerto Rican bill was out of the way, and I assumed that we had a meeting of the minds.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. It is immaterial to me. I thought possibly you could take that up and get through with it this afternoon.

Mr. McCORMACK. If the gentleman has no objection, we will take up the Puerto Rican bill first.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. To be sure you finish the program tomorrow, has the gentleman considered meeting at 11 o'clock?

Mr. McCORMACK. No. That will not be necessary. I think we will meet at 12 o'clock.

## MERCHANT SHIP SALES ACT OF 1946

Mr. HART submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (S. 3571) to continue the authority of the Secretary of Commerce under the







[PUBLIC LAW 590—81ST CONGRESS]

[CHAPTER 426—2D SESSION]

[S. 3550]

AN ACT

To continue for a temporary period certain powers, authority, and discretion for the purpose of exercising, administering, and enforcing import controls with respect to fats and oils (including butter), and rice and rice products.

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, title III of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended, and the amendments to existing law made by such title shall continue in effect until July 1, 1951, for the purpose of authorizing and exercising, administering, and enforcing of import controls with respect to fats and oils (including oil-bearing materials, fatty acids, butter, soap and soap powder, but excluding petroleum and petroleum products and coconuts and coconut products) and rice and rice products, upon a determination by the President that such controls are (a) essential to the acquisition or distribution of products in world short supply or (b) essential to the orderly liquidation of temporary surpluses of stocks owned or controlled by the Government: *Provided, however,* That such controls shall be removed as soon as the conditions giving rise to them have ceased.

Approved June 30, 1950.

